ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Comparison of Two Fluid-Management Strategies in Acute Lung Injury

The National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) Clinical Trials Network*

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND

The members of the Writing Committee (Herbert P. Wiedemann, M.D., Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland; Arthur P. Wheeler, M.D., and Gordon R. Bernard, M.D., Vanderbilt University, Nashville; B. Taylor Thompson, M.D., and Douglas Hayden, M.A., Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston; Ben deBoisblanc, M.D., Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, New Orleans; Alfred F. Connors, Jr., M.D., Case Western Reserve University at MetroHealth Medical Center, Cleveland; R. Duncan Hite, M.D., Wake Forest University Health Sciences Center, Winston-Salem, N.C.; and Andrea L. Harabin, Ph.D., National Institutes of Health National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, Bethesda, Md.) assume responsibility for the integrity of the article. Address reprint requests to Dr. Wiedemann at the Department of Pulmonary, Allergy, and Critical Care Medicine, Cleveland Clinic, 9500 Euclid Ave., Desk A-90, Cleveland, OH 44195, or at wiedemh@ccf.org.

*Participants in the ARDS Clinical Trials Network are listed in the Appendix.

This article was published at www.nejm. org on May 21, 2006.

N Engl J Med 2006;354:2564-75. Copyright © 2006 Massachusetts Medical Society. Optimal fluid management in patients with acute lung injury is unknown. Diuresis or fluid restriction may improve lung function but could jeopardize extrapulmonaryorgan perfusion.

METHODS

In a randomized study, we compared a conservative and a liberal strategy of fluid management using explicit protocols applied for seven days in 1000 patients with acute lung injury. The primary end point was death at 60 days. Secondary end points included the number of ventilator-free days and organ-failure–free days and measures of lung physiology.

RESULTS

The rate of death at 60 days was 25.5 percent in the conservative-strategy group and 28.4 percent in the liberal-strategy group (P=0.30; 95 percent confidence interval for the difference, -2.6 to 8.4 percent). The mean (±SE) cumulative fluid balance during the first seven days was -136 ± 491 ml in the conservative-strategy group and 6992±502 ml in the liberal-strategy group (P<0.001). As compared with the liberal strategy, the conservative strategy improved the oxygenation index ([mean airway pressure × the ratio of the fraction of inspired oxygen to the partial pressure of arterial oxygen] × 100) and the lung injury score and increased the number of ventilator-free days (14.6\pm0.5 vs. 12.1\pm0.5, P<0.001) and days not spent in the intensive care unit (13.4\pm0.4 vs. 11.2\pm0.4, P<0.001) during the first 28 days but did not increase the incidence or prevalence of shock during the study or the use of dialysis during the first 60 days (10 percent vs. 14 percent, P=0.06).

CONCLUSIONS

Although there was no significant difference in the primary outcome of 60-day mortality, the conservative strategy of fluid management improved lung function and shortened the duration of mechanical ventilation and intensive care without increasing nonpulmonary-organ failures. These results support the use of a conservative strategy of fluid management in patients with acute lung injury. (ClinicalTrials. gov number, NCT00281268.)

DULMONARY EDEMA RESULTING FROM INcreased capillary permeability, a hallmark of acute lung injury, worsens as intravascular hydrostatic pressure rises and oncotic pressure falls.^{1,2} Although lung failure alone can be lethal, death in patients with acute lung injury is usually due to the failure of nonpulmonary organs.^{1,3}

The optimal fluid management of acute lung injury is not settled.⁴⁻⁷ The usual practice is wideranging, and many practitioners weigh the risks and benefits of strategies of conservative as compared with liberal fluid management. In the conservative approach, fluid intake is restricted and urinary output is increased in an attempt to decrease lung edema, shorten the duration of mechanical ventilation, and improve survival. A possible risk of this approach is a decrease in cardiac output and worsening of nonpulmonaryorgan function. The liberal fluid approach essentially reverses these potential priorities and risks.

Current evidence is insufficient to support the use of either a liberal or conservative fluid strategy in patients with established acute lung injury.⁸⁻¹¹ We conducted a prospective, randomized clinical trial to investigate the risks and benefits of a fluid-management protocol with a lower (conservative use of fluids) or higher (liberal use of fluids) intravascular pressure (as defined by the pulmonary-artery occlusion pressure or central venous pressure) in patients with acute lung injury. Our primary outcome was death from any cause at 60 days.

METHODS

STUDY DESIGN

The complete protocol for this trial can be found in the Supplementary Appendix (available with the full text of this article at www.nejm.org). Patients were randomly assigned to a strategy involving either conservative or liberal use of fluids with concealed allocation in permuted blocks of eight with the use of an automated system. Participants were simultaneously randomly assigned to receive either a pulmonary-artery catheter or a central venous catheter in a two-by-two factorial design.¹²

INCLUSION CRITERIA

Eligible patients were intubated and received positive-pressure ventilation, had a ratio of the partial pressure of arterial oxygen (PaO₂) to the fraction of inspired oxygen (FiO₂) of less than 300 (adjusted if the altitude exceeded 1000 m), and had bilateral infiltrates on chest radiography consistent with the presence of pulmonary edema without evidence of left atrial hypertension.¹³ If a potential participant did not have a central venous catheter, the primary physician's intent to insert one was required.

EXCLUSION CRITERIA

Reasons for exclusion are listed in the Supplementary Appendix. Major reasons for exclusion were the presence of a pulmonary-artery catheter after the onset of acute lung injury; the presence of acute lung injury for more than 48 hours; inability to obtain consent; the presence of chronic conditions that could independently influence survival, impair weaning, or compromise compliance with the protocol (e.g., severe lung or neuromuscular disease or dependence on dialysis); and irreversible conditions for which the estimated sixmonth mortality rate exceeded 50 percent, such as advanced cancer.

STUDY PROCEDURES

Ventilation according to the Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) Network protocol of lower tidal volumes was begun within one hour after randomization and continued until day 28; a protocol was used to wean patients from mechanical ventilation.14 The assigned catheter was inserted within four hours after randomization. Hemodynamic management was started within 2 hours after catheter insertion and continued for seven days or until 12 hours after a patient was able to breathe without assistance.¹⁴ After day 3, a pulmonary-artery catheter could be replaced by a central venous catheter if hemodynamic stability (i.e., absence of the need for protocol-directed interventions on the basis of a measurement with a pulmonary-artery catheter for more than 24 hours) was achieved. We monitored compliance with protocol instructions twice each day: once during a morning reference period and again at a randomly selected time. A 100 percent audit of all instructions conducted after the first 82 patients were enrolled showed rates of protocol compliance similar to those obtained during the random checks (data not shown).

Study personnel underwent training in the con-

duct of the protocol (Fig. 1) and the measurement of vascular pressure. Vascular pressures were measured in supine patients at end expiration (identified with an airway pressure signal) but were not toring board, and the institutional review board adjusted for airway pressure.15

SUBJECTS

A National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute protocol-review committee, a data and safety moniof each participating hospital approved the study.

Measur	red intravascu	lar pressure (n	nm Hg)	МАР	MAP ≥60 mm Hg without vasopressors (except dopamine ≤5 µg/kg/min)					
C\	/P	PAG	Dbe	<60 mm Hg or a need for any vasopressor	Average urinary ou	tput <0.5 ml/kg/hr	Average urinary ou	tput ≥0.5 ml/kg/hr		
Conservative strategy	Liberal strategy	Conservative strategy	Liberal strategy	<pre>(except dopamine ≤5 µg/kg/min); consider cor- rectable causes of shock first</pre>	Ineffective Circulation Cardiac index <2.5 liters/min/m ² or cold, mottled skin with capillary- refilling time >2 sec	Effective Circulation Cardiac index ≥2.5 liters/min/m ² or absence of criteria for ineffec- tive circulation	Ineffective Circulation Cardiac index <2.5 liters/min/m ² or cold, mottled skin with capillary- refilling time >2 sec	Effective Circulation Cardiac index ≥2.5 liters/min/m ² or absence of criteria for ineffec- tive circulation		
	Rar	ge l		1 Vasopressor ^F Fluid bolus ^F	3 KVO IV Dobutamine ^A	7 KVO IV Furosemide ^{B,1,2,4}	11 KVO IV Dobutamine ^A	15 KVO IV Furosemide ^{B,1,3,4}		
>13	>18	>18	>24		Furosemide		Furosemide ^{5,1,5,4}			
Range 2]	4 KVO IV Dobutamine ^A	8 KVO IV Furosemide ^{B,1,2,4}	12 KVO IV Dobutamine ^A	16 KVO IV Furosemide ^{B,1,3,4}				
9–13	15-18	13-18	19–24							
	Rar	ige 3		2 Fluid bolus ^F Vasopressor ^F	<mark>5</mark> Fluid bolus ^C	9 Fluid bolus ^c	13 Fluid bolus ^C	17 Liberal KVO IV		
4-8	10-14	8–12	14-18	1				18 Conservative Furosemide ^{B,1,3,4}		
	Rar	ige 4]	<mark>6</mark> Fluid bolus ^C	10 Fluid bolus ^C	14 Fluid bolus ^C	19 Liberal fluid bolus		
<4	<10	<8	<14					20 Conservative KVO IV		

Figure 1. Overview of the Protocol for Conservative and Liberal Fluid Management in the Group Assigned to a Pulmonary-Artery Catheter (PAC) and the Group Assigned to a Central Venous Catheter (CVC).

At least every four hours, patients were assigned to 1 of 20 protocol cells (numbered in red in the top left-hand corner of each cell on the lower right-hand side of the figure) on the basis of four variables: central venous pressure (CVP) or pulmonary-artery occlusion pressure (PAOP), depending on catheter assignment; the presence or absence of shock (defined by the protocol as a mean systemic arterial pressure [MAP] below 60 mm Hg or the need for a vasopressor [except for a dose of dopamine of 5 µg per kilogram of body weight per minute or less]); the presence or absence of oliguria (defined by a urinary output of less than 0.5 ml per kilogram per hour); and the presence or absence of ineffective circulation (defined by a cardiac index of less than 2.5 liters per minute per square meter in the PAC group and by cold, mottled skin with a capillary-refilling time of more than 2 seconds in the CVC group). Each cell is associated with an intervention and a reassessment interval. A patient with effective circulation and normotension and without oliguria would be assigned to a cell in the far right-hand column (cells 15 to 20), depending on the intravascular pressure. These patients received furosemide or fluids to move their intravascular pressure toward the target range (in the liberal-strategy group, a CVP of 10 to 14 mm Hg and a PAOP of 14 to 18 mm Hg; in the conservative-strategy group, a CVP of less than 4 mm Hg and a PAOP of less than 8 mm Hg). For example, if such a patient had a CVP of 8 mm Hg, he or she would be assigned to cell 18 if assigned to the conservative strategy and to cell 19 if assigned to the liberal strategy. The protocol called for the conservative-strategy patient assigned to cell 18 to receive furosemide. (The footnote instructions determined the dose of furosemide on the basis of the prior response of this patient and for furosemide to be withheld if the patient had been in shock within the previous 12 hours.) In contrast, the liberal-strategy patient assigned to cell 19 would receive a fluid bolus. (The footnote instructions limited the daily fluid boluses and called for fluid to be withheld if the F_1O_2 was at least 0.7.) Lactate, oxygen delivery, and mixed venous and superior-vena-cava oxygen saturation were not used as protocol variables. For fluid boluses, clinicians were free to select isotonic crystalloid, albumin, or blood products, although the protocol dictated the volume of each administered. If patients were in shock (cells 1 and 2), treatment was left to the judgment of the physician except that after blood pressure stabilized, weaning from the vasopressor was conducted according to the protocol. Of roughly 27,000 assessments, about 19 percent resulted in the assignment of patients to cell 1 or 2 (shock), 75 percent to cells 15 through 20, 5 percent to cells 7 through 10, and 2 percent to other cells. KVO denotes keep vein open, and IV intravenous. The superscript letters and numbers refer to footnotes that may modify protocol instructions on the basis of an individual patient's physiology or response to prior instructions and are important for the safe implementation of the protocol. The protocol is described in detail in the Supplementary Appendix.

Written informed consent was obtained from participants or legally authorized surrogates. The data and safety monitoring board conducted interim analyses after the enrollment of 82 patients and then after the enrollment of approximately every 200 patients. Sequential stopping rules for safety and efficacy used the method of O'Brien and Fleming.¹⁶

ORGAN FAILURE

For 28 days, we monitored patients daily for cardiovascular, renal, and hepatic failure; coagulation abnormalities; and the need for assisted ventilation.¹⁴ The severity of lung injury was scored according to the method of Murray et al.¹⁷; the scores can range from 0 to 4, with a lower score indicating better lung function.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The study had a statistical power of 90 percent to detect a reduction by 10 percentage points (from 31 percent to 21 percent) in the primary end point, death before discharge home during the first 60 days after randomization, with the planned enrollment of 1000 patients. We assumed patients who went home without the use of assisted ventilation before day 60 were alive at 60 days. Data on patients who were receiving mechanical ventilation or in a hospital were censored on the last day of follow-up. The Kaplan-Meier method was used to estimate the mean (\pm SE) 60-day mortality rate at the time of the last death that occurred before 60 days. Differences in mortality between the groups were assessed by a z test. The primary analysis was conducted according to the intention to treat. We assessed differences in continuous variables with analysis of variance, differences in categorical variables with a Mantel-Haenszel test, and differences between continuous variables over time with repeated-measures analysis of variance. For continuous variables, means \pm SE are reported. Two-sided P values of 0.05 or less were considered to indicate statistical significance. We used SAS software (version 8.2, SAS Institute) for the analysis.

RESULTS

ENROLLMENT AND EXCLUSIONS

We screened patients at 20 North American centers between June 8, 2000, and October 3, 2005. The trial was halted on July 25, 2002, for a review by the Office of Human Research Protection and resumed unchanged on July 23, 2003, except for the introduction of a modified consent form.¹⁸⁻²⁰ Figure 2 shows the most common reasons for exclusion for the 10,511 patients who were screened but not enrolled and the follow-up for the 503 patients who were randomly assigned to conservative fluid management and the 498 who were assigned to liberal fluid management (all reasons for





The NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL of MEDICINE

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics.*			
Characteristic	Conservative Strategy (N = 503)	Liberal Strategy (N=497)	P Value
Age (yr)	50.1±0.7	49.5±0.7	0.57
Male sex (%)	52	55	0.48
Race or ethnic group (%)			0.66
White	65	63	
Black	20	24	
Hispanic	12	10	
Asian	2	2	
Other	1	1	
Primary lung injury (%)			0.33
Pneumonia	46	48	
Sepsis	22	25	
Aspiration	16	13	
Trauma	8	7	
Multiple transfusions	1	0	
Other	8	7	
Coexisting conditions (%)			
Diabetes	18	18	0.88
HIV infection or AIDS	7	8	0.68
Cirrhosis	3	3	0.89
Solid tumors	1	3	0.02
Leukemia	3	1	0.04
Lymphoma	2	1	0.42
Immunosuppression	9	7	0.27
APACHE III score†	93.1±1.4	95.2±1.4	0.28
Medical ICU (%)	66	66	0.95
Hemodynamic variables			
Mean arterial pressure (mm Hg)	77.1±0.6	77.2±0.6	0.99
CVP (mm Hg)	11.9±0.3	12.2±0.3	0.56
PAOP (mm Hg)	15.6±0.4	15.7±0.4	0.82
PAOP >18 mm Hg (%)	30	29	0.96
Cardiac index (liters/min/m²)	4.2±0.1	4.3±0.1	0.46
Mixed venous oxygen saturation (%)	69±0.78	69±0.87	0.97
Met shock criteria (%)‡	33	36	0.21
Vasopressor use (%)	31	35	0.10
Prerandomization fluid balance (ml)	2655±156	2875±166	0.34

exclusion are listed in Table 1 of the Supplementary Appendix).

BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

The two groups were similar with respect to de- **PROTOCOL CONDUCT AND INSTRUCTIONS**

es, severity of illness, organ function, fluid balance before the study began, vasopressor use, and presence of shock (Table 1).

mographic characteristics, type of intensive care The mean time from admission to the ICU to the unit (ICU), cause of lung injury, coexisting illness- first protocol instruction was 41.3±1.6 hours in

Table 1. (Continued.)			
Characteristic	Conservative Strategy (N = 503)	Liberal Strategy (N=497)	P Value
Respiratory variables			
Tidal volume (ml/kg of PBW)	7.4±0.1	7.4±0.1	0.93
Plateau pressure (cm of water)	26.2±0.4	26.2±0.4	0.99
$PaO_2:FiO_2$	157±3	153±3	0.45
Oxygenation index§	13.0±0.5	13.0±0.47	0.92
PEEP	9.4±0.2	9.5±0.2	0.63
Lung injury score¶	2.7±0.03	2.7±0.03	0.52
рН	7.36±0.00	7.36±0.00	0.46
Renal and metabolic variables			
Blood urea nitrogen (mg/dl)	23.2±0.8	24.1±0.8	0.44
Creatinine (mg/dl)	1.24±0.04	1.29±0.04	0.39
Bicarbonate (mmol/liter)	22.5±0.23	22.0±0.23	0.13
Hemoglobin (g/dl)	10.4±0.08	10.4±0.09	0.90
Glucose (mg/dl)	138±2.84	142±3.65	0.38

* Plus-minus values are means ±SE. Race was assigned by the coordinators on the basis of hospital records or information from the next of kin. Because of rounding, percentages may not total 100. HIV denotes human immunodeficiency virus, AIDS acquired immunodeficiency syndrome, CVP central venous pressure, PAOP pulmonary-artery occlusion pressure, PBW predicted body weight, and PEEP positive end-expiratory pressure.

† Scores for the Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE III) can range from 0 to 299, with higher scores indicating a higher risk of death.

‡ Shock was defined by a mean arterial pressure of less than 60 mm Hg or the need for a vasopressor (except for a dose of dopamine of 5 μ g per kilogram per minute or less).

 \int The oxygenation index is calculated with the use of the following equation: (mean airway pressure × FiO₂:PaO₂) × 100. A lower number indicates better gas exchange.

¶ Scores can range from 0 to 4, with higher scores indicating more severe lung injury.

To convert the values for blood urea nitrogen to millimoles per liter, multiply by 0.357. To convert the values for creatinine to micromoles per liter, multiply by 88.4. To convert the values for glucose to millimoles per liter, multiply by 0.05551

the liberal-strategy group and 43.8±2.5 hours in the conservative-strategy group (P=0.42). The rate of compliance with instructions was similar in the two groups (91 percent in the liberal-strategy group and 88 percent in the conservative-strategy group, P=0.06), even though patients in the former group received more protocol instructions per day (5.1 vs. 4.1, P<0.001). Patients in the conservative-strategy group received furosemide more frequently than did patients in the liberal-strategy group (41 percent vs. 10 percent of instructions, P<0.001), whereas patients in the latter group more often received a fluid bolus (15 percent vs. 6 percent of instructions, P<0.001). More furosemide was given to the conservative-strategy group (Table 2). Dobutamine use was similar and uncommon in both groups (4 percent in the liberal-strategy group and 6 percent in the conservative-strategy group). At least one blood transfusion was given to 29 (Fig. 1 of the Supplementary Appendix). For pa-

percent of patients in the conservative-strategy group and to 39 percent of patients in the liberalstrategy group (P<0.001). During the study, there was no significant difference in the use of drotrecogin alfa (19 percent in the conservative-strategy group vs. 21 percent in the liberal-strategy group, P=0.70) or systemic corticosteroids (32 percent vs. 37 percent, P = 0.09).

FLUID BALANCE

Each study day the liberal-strategy group received more fluid than the conservative-strategy group and on days 1 through 4 had a lower urinary output, resulting in a higher cumulative fluid balance (Table 2). During the study, the seven-day cumulative fluid balance was -136±491 ml in the conservative-strategy group, as compared with 6992±502 ml in the liberal-strategy group (P<0.001)

Tabl	le 2. Furosemide Do	se, Fluid Intake, Fluid (Output, and Fluid Balan	ice on Each Day during	the Study.*			
Day	Furo	semide	Fluid I	Intake	Fluid C	Dutput	Fluid Ba	alance
	Liberal	Conservative	Liberal	Conservative	Liberal	Conservative	Liberal	Conservative
	mg/24 hr (i	10. of patients)	ml/24 hr (no	. of patients)	ml/24 hr (no.	. of patients)	ml/24 hr (no.	of patients)
Ч	74.27±7.48 (133)	148.94±8.52 (312)	5029.8±132.98 (485)	4230.5±120.03 (491)	2501.9±73.23 (485)	3043.8±93.90 (491)	2529.5±148.99 (484)	1186.7±151.01 (491)
2	72.46±6.65 (146)	157.35±8.91 (304)	4467.4±136.11 (479)	3590.6±98.45 (480)	2824.5±101.44 (479)	3966.7±115.57 (480)	1642.9±151.71 (479)	<i>−</i> 376.1±161.08 (480)
3	65.28±6.49 (140)	166.90±10.01 (269)	3997.1±103.40 (465)	3390.4±85.30 (464)	3060.9±103.23 (465)	3797.3±110.48 (465)	936.12±115.32 (465)	−408.5±135.90 (464)
4	80.74±10.23 (129)	154.25±10.61 (228)	3752.0±102.07 (444)	3430.8±96.49 (437)	3188.1±109.19 (444)	3606.1±113.38 (434)	563.88±100.98 (444)	-165.5±119.92 (434)
S	73.06±8.41 (119)	164.71±12.06 (197)	3825.3±110.62 (424)	3201.1±87.23 (411)	3358.7±115.49 (421)	3444.8 ± 108.98 (408)	483.03±109.98 (421)	-226.3±115.22 (408)
9	58.20±6.68 (106)	158.87±13.45 (165)	3782.8±104.28 (411)	3159.4±88.12 (382)	3334.4±123.99 (411)	3316.9±103.81 (379)	508.04±111.75 (410)	-144.9±110.25 (378)
7	51.03±4.31 (87)	127.86±11.61 (137)	3639.7±93.96 (390)	3226.9±108.18 (355)	3216.8±98.36 (385)	3143.9±100.16 (346)	458.95±106.85 (385)	130.08±118.47 (346)
f Plus id m day	Hinus values are r Heasurement. P<0.00 7 (P=0.61); and flui	neans ±SE. Numbers i)1 for all comparisons d balance on day 7 (P:	in parentheses indicate except for fluid intake c =0.04). Negative fluid b	the number of patient on day 4 (P=0.02) and oalance means that flui	s receiving at least one day 7 (P=0.004); fluid (id output exceeded fluid	dose of furosemide on ⁻ output on day 4 (P=0.0 I intake.	that day or the number 08), day 5 (P=0.58), da	r of patients with a flu- ay 6 (P=0.94), and

tients who were in shock at baseline, the cumulative seven-day fluid balance was 2904±1008 ml in the conservative-strategy group and 10,138± 922 ml in the liberal-strategy group (P<0.001). For patients who were not in shock at baseline, the cumulative fluid balance was -1576±519 ml in the conservative-strategy group and 5287±576 ml in the liberal-strategy group (P<0.001).

HEMODYNAMICS

Intravascular pressures declined in the conservative-strategy group but remained essentially unchanged in the liberal-strategy group (Fig. 2 in the Supplementary Appendix). The conservativestrategy group had a slightly lower mean arterial pressure, stroke volume, and cardiac index, but the heart rate, mixed venous oxygen saturation, and percentage of patients receiving vasopressors did not differ significantly between the two groups (Table 2A in the Supplementary Appendix). For patients in shock at randomization, approximately 40 percent of subsequent measurements met the criteria for shock in both treatment groups. For patients who were not in shock at baseline, there were no significant differences between groups in the incidence of shock during study (32 percent in the liberal-strategy group and 28 percent in the conservative-strategy group, P=0.29) or in the proportions of protocol reassessments classified as shock (6 percent and 7 percent, respectively; P=0.78).

LUNG FUNCTION

Ventilator settings and lung-function data are shown in Table 2B of the Supplementary Appendix. The conservative-strategy group had better lung injury scores and oxygenation indexes, as well as lower plateau pressures and positive endexpiratory pressures. The partial pressure of arterial carbon dioxide, arterial pH, and the PaO₂:FiO₂ were slightly higher in the conservative-strategy group on all study days, but this difference did not reach significance for the PaO_2 :FiO₂ (P=0.07).

METABOLIC AND RENAL FUNCTION

The conservative-strategy group had slightly higher creatinine values than the liberal-strategy group during the study, but this difference did not reach significance (P=0.06) (Table 2C of the Supplementary Appendix). The conservative-strategy group had higher levels of blood urea nitrogen, bicarbonate, hemoglobin, albumin, and calculated colloid

2570

osmotic pressure during the study.²¹ There were no significant differences in mean serum sodium levels during the study.

SAFETY

Metabolic alkalosis and electrolyte imbalances were reported as an adverse event (none with associated arrhythmias) more frequently with the conservative strategy (42 events, 3 serious) than with the liberal strategy (19 events, 1 serious) (P=0.001). More patients in the conservative-strategy group than in the liberal-strategy group had at least one potassium value of 3.0 mmol per liter or less (26 percent vs. 22 percent, P<0.001), one sodium value of at least 150 mmol per liter (25 percent vs. 18 percent, P=0.009), or one bicarbonate value of more than 40 mmol per liter (6 percent vs. 2 percent, P<0.001). There was no significant difference in the percentage of patients with at least one potassium value of 2.5 mmol per liter or less (4 percent vs. 3 percent, P=0.23).

MAJOR OUTCOMES

Major outcomes are shown in Table 3 and Figure 3. There was no interaction between the interventions of the factorial design (type of fluid management and type of catheter, P=0.26). Therefore, results are reported according to the fluidmanagement strategy, irrespective of catheter assignment. The in-hospital death rate during the first 60 days after randomization was 25.5±1.9 percent in the conservative-strategy group and 28.4±2.0 percent in the liberal-strategy group (P=0.30; 95 percent confidence interval for thedifference, -2.6 to 8.4 percent). The conservativestrategy group had more ventilator-free days, days free of central nervous system failure, and ICU-free days during the first 28 days. There were no significant differences in the number of failure-free days for other organs during the first 28 days, although there was a small (0.3 day) increase in the number of cardiovascular-failure-free days during the first 7 days with the liberal strategy. Within the first 60 days, there were no significant differences in either the percentage of patients receiving renal-replacement therapy (10 percent in the conservative-strategy group vs. 14 percent in the liberal-strategy group, P=0.06) or the average number of days of renal support (11.0±1.7 vs. 10.9 ± 1.4 , P=0.96). There were no significant interactions between baseline shock status and treatment with respect to the mortality rate or the higher mortality rate (38.5 percent of 52 Hispanic

Table 3. Main Outcome Variable	s.*		
Outcome	Conservative Strategy	Liberal Strategy	P Value
Death at 60 days (%)	25.5	28.4	0.30
Ventilator-free days from day 1 to day 28†	14.6±0.5	12.1±0.5	<0.001
ICU-free days†			
Days 1 to 7	0.9±0.1	0.6±0.1	<0.001
Days 1 to 28	13.4±0.4	11.2±0.4	<0.001
Organ-failure–free days†∷			
Days 1 to 7			
Cardiovascular failure	3.9±0.1	4.2±0.1	0.04
CNS failure	3.4±0.2	2.9±0.2	0.02
Renal failure	5.5±0.1	5.6±0.1	0.45
Hepatic failure	5.7±0.1	5.5±0.1	0.12
Coagulation abnormalities	5.6±0.1	5.4±0.1	0.23
Days 1 to 28			
Cardiovascular failure	19.0±0.5	19.1±0.4	0.85
CNS failure	18.8±0.5	17.2±0.5	0.03
Renal failure	21.5±0.5	21.2±0.5	0.59
Hepatic failure	22.0±0.4	21.2±0.5	0.18
Coagulation abnormalities	22.0±0.4	21.5±0.4	0.37
Dialysis to day 60			
Patients (%)	10	14	0.06
Days	11.0±1.7	10.9±1.4	0.96

* Plus-minus values are means ±SE. CNS denotes central nervous system. † This was an a priori secondary outcome.

‡ For this analysis, cardiovascular failure was defined by a systolic blood pressure of 90 mm Hg or less or the need for a vasopressor (in contrast, shock was defined by a mean arterial pressure of less than 60 mm Hg or the need for a vasopressor [except a dose of dopamine of 5 μ g per kilogram per minute or less]); a coagulation abnormality was defined by a platelet count of 80,000 per cubic millimeter or less; hepatic failure was defined by a serum bilirubin level of at least 2 mg per deciliter (34 µmol per liter); and renal failure was defined by a serum creatinine level of at least 2 mg per deciliter (177 μ mol per liter). We calculated the number of days without organ or system failure by subtracting the number of days with organ failure from the lesser of 28 days or the number of days to death. Organs and systems were considered failurefree after patients were discharged from the hospital.

number of ventilator-free days or ICU-free days (Table 3 of the Supplementary Appendix).

Black patients had a higher overall rate of death (37.3 percent of 118 black patients in the liberal-strategy group and 31.3 percent of 99 black patients in the conservative-strategy group) than white patients (22.7 percent of 313 white patients in the liberal-strategy group and 23.5 percent of 328 white patients in the conservative-strategy group) (P=0.002). Hispanic patients also had a



patients in the liberal-strategy group and 23.0 percent of 61 Hispanic patients in the conservative-strategy group) than whites, but this difference did not reach significance (P=0.10). After adjustment for baseline covariates, the hazard ratio for death among blacks as compared with whites was not significant (hazard ratio, 1.29; 95 percent confidence interval, 0.97 to 1.73), whereas it was significant for Hispanics (hazard ratio, 1.58; 95 percent confidence interval, 1.08 to 2.31). The interaction between treatment and race for whites as compared with nonwhites was not significant (P=0.10), nor was it significant in any of the racial or ethnic subgroups. There was also no significant interaction between treatment and sex.

DISCUSSION

Although we did not detect a significant difference between the conservative strategy and the liberal strategy of fluid management in the primary outcome of 60-day mortality, the conservative strategy improved lung function and shortened the duration of mechanical ventilation and intensive care without increasing nonpulmonary-organ failures. The overall difference in mortality according to race or ethnic group has previously been described in patients with acute lung injury²² and could be due to several factors, including socioeconomic disparities or genetic determinants.²³

The two strategies were designed to be prudent but distinctly different approaches to fluid therapy. To place the results of our study in context, it is useful to consider how these fluid strategies compare with usual practice. In this regard, it is of interest that the cumulative seven-day fluid balance in the liberal-strategy group (6992±502 ml) was similar to that among patients in ARDS Network studies in which the approach to fluid management was not specified^{14,24} (Fig. 1 of the Supplementary Appendix). These findings are similar to those reported by Simmons et al.8 in 1987, suggesting that the liberal approach to fluid management reflects long-standing practices. The usual practice resembles the liberal approach in another aspect: the prestudy baseline measurements for central venous pressure (12.2 mm Hg) and pulmonary-artery-occlusion pressure (15.7 mm Hg) were both within the target ranges for the liberal fluid strategy (10 to 14 mm Hg and 14 to 18 mm Hg, respectively).

Comparisons of our study to other studies of goal-directed management in critically ill patients are problematic because of differences in protocols, patient populations, and timing of the interventions. Whereas we targeted central venous pressure or pulmonary-artery occlusion pressure in patients with recent onset of acute lung injury, previous studies targeted the cardiac index, oxygen delivery, or mixed venous oxygen saturation in heterogeneous populations of critically ill patients.²⁵⁻³¹ Rivers et al.³² demonstrated in patients with severe sepsis or septic shock the efficacy of six hours of early, goal-directed resuscitation in the emergency department before admission to the ICU. In contrast, our patients received their first protocol intervention an average of 43 hours after admission to the ICU and 24 hours after meeting the criteria for acute lung injury.

The conservative-strategy group had higher serum oncotic pressures and lower intravascular pressures — characteristics that would be expected to limit the development of pulmonary edema. With lung injury, small increases in the pulmonary-artery occlusion pressure are associated with large increases in extravascular lung water.² The higher albumin and hemoglobin levels in the conservative-strategy group appear to be primarily related to hemoconcentration (or less hemodilution), since the rate of albumin use was low and not significantly different between groups and redcell transfusions were more frequent in the liberalstrategy group.

Our results are consistent with those obtained in studies in animals suggesting improved lung function with diuretics and fluid restriction33-37 and with the results of observational studies in humans indicating increased survival with a lower fluid balance and a reduction in the pulmonaryartery occlusion pressure.6,8,9 Mitchell and colleagues¹⁰ randomly assigned 89 patients with pulmonary edema to receive diuretics and fluid restriction based on extravascular lung water or routine fluid management; the group with fluid restriction had a lower fluid balance, fewer days of ventilator use, and fewer days in the ICU. Martin and coworkers¹¹ randomly assigned 37 patients with hypoproteinemia and acute lung injury to receive either a five-day specified regimen of furosemide and colloid replacement or placebo infusions. The treated group had an increase in the PaO₂:FiO₂ within 24 hours. We do not know whether using lung-water measurements to drive protocol instructions or increasing the use of colloid would have increased the benefits of the conservative strategy in our study.

The hemodynamic consequences of the conservative strategy were small and apparently of minimal clinical significance. Although the mean arterial pressure, stroke volume, and cardiac index were slightly lower in the conservative-strategy group than in the liberal-strategy group, there were no significant differences in mixed venous oxygenation or in the incidence or duration of shock. Although the conservative strategy was associated with a slightly higher blood urea nitrogen level, the creatinine level, the number of days without renal failure, and the need for dialysis were similar in the two groups. Possible reasons for the greater number of days without central nervous system failure in the conservative-strategy group include a reduced incidence of cerebral edema, differences in acid-base status, or a lower rate of use of sedation as improved lung function permitted earlier removal from the ventilator. The available data are not sufficient to distinguish among these or other potential explanations.

The protocols were designed to minimize risks. During shock, physicians treated patients according to their usual practice. Because of concern that a conservative approach might worsen cardiovascular or renal function, diuretic administration was suspended until 12 hours after a fluid bolus or the reversal of shock, and prompt fluid administration was provided in the event of oliguria or ineffective circulation. Diuretic therapy was titrated on the basis of the patient's response, avoided in patients with worsening renal function, and limited to a daily maximum. To minimize the risk of excessive fluid therapy, protocol-mandated fluid administration in patients without shock was limited to three boluses per day and was withheld in patients without shock who had severe hypoxemia ($F_1O_2 \ge 0.7$) or a cardiac index of at least 4.5 liters per minute per square meter of body-surface area.

Electrolyte levels were managed by the clinician. The conservative-strategy group had a higher partial pressure of arterial carbon dioxide, arterial pH, and bicarbonate level than did the liberal-strategy group. Although mean differences between the groups in the serum sodium, potassium, and bicarbonate levels were small, a higher percentage of patients in the conservative-strategy group had at least one potassium value between 2.5 and 3.0 mmol per liter, at least one sodium value of 150 mmol per liter or more, and at least one bicarbonate value of 40 mmol per liter or more. Hence, close monitoring of electrolyte levels is warranted during diuretic therapy.

Since we tested specific management strategies that used several variables and safeguards, we do not know whether the safety and benefit of the conservative protocol could be realized by using the simplified target of a zero fluid balance. Departures from the specific hemodynamic and ventilator protocols used in this trial may lead to clinical outcomes that differ from those observed in this study.

In conclusion, we found that use of a conservative fluid-management protocol with a lower central venous pressure or pulmonary-artery occlusion pressure target resulted in a major reduction in net fluid balance without an increase in adverse events, as compared with a liberal fluidmanagement protocol targeting higher intravascular filling pressures. Although we did not detect a difference in the mortality rate between the two approaches, the conservative strategy improved lung function and shortened the duration of mechanical ventilation and intensive care, without increasing nonpulmonary organ failures. These results support the use of a conservative strategy of fluid management in patients with acute lung injury.

Supported by contracts (NO1-HR-46046-64 and NO1-HR-16146-54) with the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, National Institutes of Health.

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

The NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL of MEDICINE

APPENDIX

The following persons and institutions participated in the trial: Writing Committee - H.P. Wiedemann, A.P. Wheeler, G.R. Bernard, B.T. Thompson, B. deBoisblanc, A.F. Connors, R.D. Hite, D. Hayden, A.L. Harabin; Steering Committee Chair - G.R. Bernard; Clinical Coordinating Center - D.A. Schoenfeld, B.T. Thompson, N. Ringwood, C. Oldmixon, F. Molay, A. Korpak, R. Morse, D. Hayden, M. Ancukiewicz, A. Minihan; Protocol-Review Committee - J.G.N. Garcia, R. Balk, S. Emerson, M. Shasby, W. Sibbald; Data Safety and Monitoring Board - R. Spragg, G. Corbie-Smith, J. Kelley, K. Leeper, A.S. Slutsky, B. Turnbull, C. Vreim; National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute — A.L. Harabin, D. Gail, P. Lew, M. Waclawiw; ARDS Clinical Trials Network Consultant — P. Parsons; Clinical Centers — University of Washington, Harborview — L. Hudson, K. Steinberg, M. Neff, R. Maier, K. Sims, C. Cooper, T. Berry-Bell, G. Carter, L. Andersson; University of Michigan - G.B. Toews, R.H. Bartlett, C. Watts, R. Hyzy, D. Arnoldi, R. Dechert, M. Purple; Universitu of Maryland — H. Silverman, C. Shanholtz, A. Moore, L. Heinrich, W. Corral; Johns Hopkins University — R. Brower, D. Thompson, H. Fessler, S. Murray, A. Sculley; Cleveland Clinic Foundation — H.P. Wiedemann, A.C. Arroliga, J. Komara, T. Isabella, M. Ferrari; University Hospitals of Cleveland — J. Kern, R. Hejal, D. Haney; MetroHealth Medical Center — A.F. Connors; University of Colorado Health Sciences Center - E. Abraham, R. McIntyre, F. Piedalue; Denver Veterans Affairs Medical Center — C. Welsh; Denver Health Medical Center — I. Douglas, R. Wolkin; St. Anthony Hospital- T. Bost, B. Sagel, A. Hawkes; Duke University - N. MacIntyre, J. Govert, W. Fulkerson, L. Mallatrat, L. Brown, S. Everett, E. VanDyne, N. Knudsen, M. Gentile; University of North Carolina - P. Rock, S. Carson, C. Schuler, L. Baker, V. Salo; Vanderbilt University — A.P. Wheeler, G. Bernard, T. Rice, B. Christman, S. Bozeman, T. Welch; University of Pennsylvania — P. Lanken, J. Christie, B. Fuchs, B Finkel, S. Kaplan, V. Gracias, C.W. Hanson, P. Reilly, M.B. Shapiro, R. Burke, E. O'Connor, D. Wolfe; Jefferson Medical College — J. Gottlieb, P. Park, D.M. Dillon, A. Girod, J. Furlong; LDS Hospital — A. Morris, C. Grissom, L. Weaver, J. Orme, T. Clemmer, R. Davis, J. Gleed, S. Pies, T. Graydon, S. Anderson, K. Bennion, P. Skinner; McKay-Dee Hospital — C. Lawton, J. d'Hulst, D. Hanselman; Utah Valley Regional Medical Center — K. Sundar, T. Hill, K. Ludwig, D. Nielson; University of California, San Francisco — M.A. Matthay, M. Eisner, B. Daniel, O. Garcia; San Francisco General — J. Luce, R. Kallet; University of California, San Francisco, Fresno — M. Peterson, J. Lanford; Baylor College of Medicine — K. Guntupalli, V. Bandi, C. Pope; Baystate Medical Center — J. Steingrub, M. Tidswell, L. Kozikowski; Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center — B. deBoisblanc, J. Hunt, C. Glynn, P. Lauto, G. Meyaski, C. Romaine; Louisiana State University Earl K. Long Center - S. Brierre, C. LeBlanc, K. Reed; Alton-Ochsner Clinic Foundation - D. Taylor, C. Thompson; Tulane University Medical Center - F. Simeone, M. Johnston, M. Wright; University of Chicago - G. Schmidt, J. Hall, S. Hemmann, B. Gehlbach, A. Vinayak, W. Schweickert; Northwestern University - J. Dematte D'Amico, H. Donnelly; University of Texas Health Sciences Center - A. Anzueto, J. McCarthy, S. Kucera, J. Peters, T. Houlihan, R. Steward, D. Vines; University of Virginia - J. Truwit, A.F. Connors, M. Marshall, W. Matsumura, R. Brett; University of Pittsburgh — M. Donahoe, P. Linden, J. Puyana, L. Lucht, A. Verno; Wake Forest University — R.D. Hite, P. Morris, A. Howard, A. Nesser, S. Perez; Moses Cone Memorial Hospital - P. Wright, C. Carter-Cole, J. McLean; St. Paul's Hospital, Vancouver — J. Russell, L. Lazowski, K. Foley; Vancouver General Hospital — D. Chittock, L. Grandolfo; Mayo Foundation — M. Murray.

REFERENCES

1. Ware LB, Matthay MA. The acute respiratory distress syndrome. N Engl J Med 2000:342:1334-49.

2. Sibbald WJ, Short AK, Warshawski FJ, Cunninghan DG, Cheung H. Thermal dye measurements of extravascular lung water in critically ill patients: intravascular Starling forces and extravascular lung water in the adult respiratory distress syndrome. Chest 1985;87:585-92.

3. Montgomery AB, Stager MA, Carrico CJ, Hudson LD. Causes of mortality in patients with the adult respiratory distress syndrome. Am Rev Respir Dis 1985;132: 485-9.

4. Hudson LD. Fluid management strategy in acute lung injury. Am Rev Respir Dis 1992;145:988-9. [Errata, Am Rev Respir Dis 1992;146:540, 808.]

5. Hyers TM. ARDS: the therapeutic dilemma. Chest 1990;97:1025.

6. Schuller D, Mitchell JP, Caladrino FS, Schuster DP. Fluid balance during pulmonary edema: is fluid gain a marker or a cause of poor outcome? Chest 1991;100: 1068-75.

7. Schuster DP. The case for and against fluid restriction and occlusion pressure reduction in adult respiratory distress syndrome. New Horiz 1993;1:478-88.

8. Simmons RS, Berndine GG, Seidenfeld JJ, et al. Fluid balance and the adult respiratory distress syndrome. Am Rev Respir Dis 1987;135:924-9.

9. Humphrey H, Hall J, Sznajder I, Silverstein M, Wood L. Improved survival in

ARDS patients associated with a reduction in pulmonary capillary wedge pressure. Chest 1990:97:1176-80.

 Mitchell JP, Schuller D, Calandrino FS, Schuster DP. Improved outcome based on fluid management in critically ill patients requiring pulmonary artery catheterization. Am Rev Respir Dis 1992;145:990-8.
Martin GS, Mangialardi RJ, Wheeler AP, Dupont WD, Morris JA, Bernard GR. Albumin and furosemide therapy in hypoproteinemic patients with acute lung injury. Crit Care Med 2002:30:2175-82.

12. The National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) Clinical Trials Network. Pulmonary-artery versus central venous catheter to guide treatment of acute lung injury. N Engl J Med 2006;354:2213-24.

13. Bernard GR, Artigas A, Brigham KL, et al. The American-European Consensus Conference on ARDS: definitions, mechanisms, relevant outcomes, and clinical trial coordination. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1994;149:818-24.

14. The Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome Network. Ventilation with lower tidal volumes as compared with traditional tidal volumes for acute lung injury and the acute respiratory distress syndrome. N Engl J Med 2000;342:1301-8.

15. Rizvi K, Deboisblanc BP, Truwit JD, et al. Effect of airway pressure display on interobserver agreement in the assessment of vascular pressures in patients with acute lung injury and acute respira-

tory distress syndrome. Crit Care Med 2005;33:98-103.

16. O'Brien PC, Fleming TR. A multiple testing procedure for clinical trials. Biometrics 1979;35:549-56.

17. Murray JF, Matthay MA, Luce JM, Flick MR. An expanded definition of the adult respiratory distress syndrome. Am Rev Respir Dis 1988;138:720-3. [Erratum, Am Rev Respir Dis 1989;139:1065.]

18. Drazen JM. Controlling research trials. N Engl J Med 2003;348:1377-80.

19. Steinbrook R. How best to ventilate? Trial design and patient safety in studies of the acute respiratory distress syndrome. N Engl J Med 2003;348:1393-401.

20. Steinbrook R. Trial design and patient safety — the debate continues. N Engl J Med 2003;349:629-30.

21. Landis EM, Pappenheimer JR. Exchange of substances through capillary walls. In: Hamilton WF, ed. Handbook of physiology. Washington, D.C.: American Physiologic Society, 1963:961-1034.

22. Moss M, Mannino DM. Race and gender differences in acute respiratory distress syndrome deaths in the United States: an analysis of multiple-cause mortality data (1979-1996). Crit Care Med 2002;30:1679-85.

23. Barnes KC. Genetic determinants and ethnic disparities in sepsis-associated acute lung injury. Proc Am Thorac Soc 2005;2:195-201.

24. Brower RG, Lanken PN, MacIntyre N, et al. High versus lower positive end-expi-

respiratory distress syndrome. N Engl J Med 2004;351:327-36.

25. Shoemaker WC, Appel PL, Kram HB, Waxman K, Lee TS. Prospective trial of supranormal values of survivors as therapeutic goals in high-risk surgical patients. Chest 1988;94:1176-86.

26. Martin C, Saux P, Eon B, Aknin P, Gouin F. Septic shock: a goal-directed therapy using volume loading, dobutamine and/or norepinephrine. Acta Anesthesiol Scand 1990;34:413-7.

27. Fleming A, Bishop M, Shoemaker W, et al. Prospective trial of supranormal values as goals of resuscitation in severe trauma. Arch Surg 1992;127:1175-9.

28. Tuchschmidt J, Fried J, Astiz M, Rackow E. Elevation of cardiac output and oxygen delivery improves outcome in septic shock. Chest 1992;102:216-20.

29. Yu M, Levy MM, Smith P, Takiguchi

ratory pressures in patients with the acute SA, Miyasaki A, Myers SA. Effect of maximizing oxygen delivery on morbidity and mortality rates in critically ill patients: a prospective, randomized, controlled study. Crit Care Med 1993;21:830-8.

> 30. Hayes MA, Timmins AC, Yau EH, Palazzo M, Hinds CJ, Watson D. Elevation of systemic oxygen delivery in the treatment of critically ill patients. N Engl J Med 1994:330:1717-22.

> 31. Gattinoni L, Brazzi L, Pelosi P, et al. A trial of goal-oriented hemodynamic therapy in critically ill patients. N Engl J Med 1995;333:1025-32.

> 32. Rivers E, Nguyen B, Havstad S, et al. Early goal-directed therapy in the treatment of severe sepsis and septic shock. N Engl J Med 2001;345:1368-77.

> 33. Ali J, Chernicki W, Wood LD. Effect of furosemide in canine low-pressure pulmonary edema. J Clin Invest 1979;64:1494-504.

34. Prewitt RM, McCarthy J, Wood LD. Treatment of acute low-pressure pulmonary edema in dogs: relative effects of hydrostatic and oncotic pressure, nitroprusside, and positive end-expiratory pressure. J Clin Invest 1981;67:409-18.

35. Long R, Breen PH, Mayers I, Wood LD. Treatment of canine aspiration pneumonitis: fluid volume reduction vs. fluid volume expansion. J Appl Physiol 1988;65:1736-44. 36. Molloy WD, Lee KY, Girling L, Prewitt RM. Treatment of canine permeability pulmonary edema: short-term effects of dobutamine, furosemide, and hydralazine. Circulation 1985;72:1365-71.

37. Reising CA, Chendrasekhar A, Wall PL, Paradise NF, Timberlake GA, Moorman DW. Continuous dose furosemide as a therapeutic approach to acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS). J Surg Res 1999;82:56-60.

Copyright © 2006 Massachusetts Medical Society.

CLINICAL TRIAL REGISTRATION

The Journal encourages investigators to register their clinical trials in a public trials registry. The members of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors plan to consider clinical trials for publication only if they have been registered (see N Engl J Med 2004;351:1250-1). The National Library of Medicine's www.clinicaltrials.gov is a free registry, open to all investigators, that meets the committee's requirements.

Supplementary Appendix

This appendix has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

Supplement to: The National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) Clinical Trials Network. Comparison of two fluid-management strategies in acute lung injury. N Engl J Med 2006;354:2564-75.

Supplemental Table 1: Exclusions occurring in > 1% of screened patients

Characteristic	Sole reason	One of several reasons
Presence of PAC	13.5	20.8
Physician refusal	13.6	15.9
Chronic lung disease	9.4	13.8
High 6 month mortality	5.2	10.6
Dialysis requirement	5.0	9.3
Time window exceeded	5.9	8.4
Chronic liver disease	4.9	7.5
Acute MI	3.6	6.4
Unable to obtain consent	4.6	5.8
Refusal of consent	4.2	4.3
Not committed to full support	1.8	3.6
Neuromuscular disease	2.0	2.9
Other	2.2	2.2
Vasculitis hemorrhage	1.1	1.9
Bone marrow transplant	1.3	1.9
Morbid obesity	1.0	1.8
No intent to obtain central access	0.9	1.2
Lung transplant	0.6	1.1

Variable	Day 1		Day	/ 2	Day	y 3	Da	у 4	Da	у 7	Р
	Conserv.	Liberal	Conserv.	Liberal	Conserv.	Liberal	Conserv.	Liberal	Conserv.	Liberal	
Vasopressor Use											
% of patients	32	30	26	22	19	16	14	12	13	9	p=0.25
# of patients	496	489	483	480	468	466	440	446	369	398	
CI (L/min/m2)	3.96 ± 0.09	4.19 ± 0.08	3.98 ± 0.08	4.23 ± 0.08	4.02 ± 0.08	4.31 ± 0.09	4.14 ± 0.10	4.37 ± 0.10	4.07 ± 0.13	4.37 ± 0.13	p=0.005
# of patients	235	223	229	222	202	208	161	182	67	87	
MAP (mm Hg)	77.73 ± 0.59	78.26 ± 0.65	79.95± 0.74	80.55±0.70	81.38 ± 0.66	83.19±0.71	81.84 ± 0.74	84.87 ± 0.78	81.00 ± 0.80	84.36 ± 0.85	p=0.03
# of patients.	495	488	481	476	464	464	429	443	350	386	
Stroke Volume	41± 0.1	44 ±0.1	42±0.1	45±0.1	43±0.1	47±0.1	43 ± 0.1	48±0.1	44 ± 0.2	49±0.2	p=0.001
# of patients	235	233	229	222	202	208	161	182	67	87	
S? O ₂	68.92 ± 1.24	66.52 ± 1.17	71.07 ± 1.00	69.73±1.22	70.02 ± 1.02	69.47±1.21	71.22 ± 1.05	69.25 ± 1.15	69.27 ± 2.41	66.93 ± 2.37	p=0.99
# of patients.	85	93	86	82	66	76	59	67	22	30	

Supplemental Table 2a. Hemodynamic Values During Fluid Management

Abbreviations: Con., conservative; Lib., liberal; #, number; CI, cardiac index; MAP, mean arterial pressure; Stroke Volume, stoke volume index in ml/m/m2; S? O₂, oxygen saturation of mixed venous blood.

Supplemental Table 2b. Respiratory Values During Fluid Management

Variable	Da	ay 1	Da	ay 2	Da	у З	Da	ay 4	Da	iy 7	Р
	Con.	Lib.	Con.	Lib.	Con.	Lib.	Con.	Lib.	Con.	Lib.	
PaO ₂ /FiO ₂	172 ± 3	169 ± 4	182 ± 4	174 ± 4	186 ± 4	177 ± 4	186 ± 5	176 ± 4	198 ± 8	183 ± 6	p=0.07
# of patients	436	431	375	388	366	387	278	322	197	264	
PaCo ₂ mm Hg	43.33 ± 0.59	41.33±0.51	43.87±0.54	42.90±0.66	45.42±0.62	43.62±0.59	45.72 ± 0.66	43.87 ± 0.64	47.74±0.88	45.84±0.78	p=0.02
# of patients	436	431	376	389	366	387	278	322	198	264	
Arterial pH	7.37 ± 0.00	7.36 ± 0.00	7.39 ± 0.01	7.37 ± 0.00	7.41± 0.00	7.38 ± 0.00	7.42 ± 0.00	7.39 ± 0.00	7.42 ± 0.01	7.40 ± 0.01	p<0.001
# of patients	436	431	377	389	366	387	279	322	198	264	
Tidal volume	6.24 ± 0.04	6.32 ± 0.05	6.24 ± 0.05	6.31± 0.06	6.25 ± 0.05	6.31± 0.06	6.26 ± 0.07	6.28± 0.05	6.36 ± 0.10	6.34± 0.07	
(mL/kg PBW)											p=0.38
# of patients	452	458	379	394	317	360	260	316	161	239	
PEEP	9.17± 0.17	9.34 ± 0.18	8.24 ± 0.16	8.74± 0.18	7.74 ± 0.16	8.47±0.18	7.67 ± 0.20	8.20 ± 0.18	7.51 ± 0.25	8.19 ± 0.21	p=0.008
(cm H2O)											
# of patients	488	489	445	457	400	421	343	382	221	300	
Plat Pres	23.95 ± 0.32	24.95 ± 0.32	24.13±0.35	25.02±0.37	23.72±0.39	24.43±0.38	23.40 ± 0.43	24.78± 0.47	24.19±0.62	25.65±0.53	
(cm H2O)											p=0.002
# of patients	424	430	359	374	301	334	241	295	145	214	
Oxygenation	11.4 ± 0.4	12.4 ± 0.5	10.5 ± 0.4	12.2 ± 0.6	9.7 ± 0.4	11.7 ± 0.6	9.5 ± 0.5	11.2 ± 0.5	10.1 ± 0.8	11.8 ± 0.7	
Index											p=0.003
# of patients	390	394	322	341	303	337	229	273	154	218	-
Murray LIS	2.52 ± 0.03	2.61± 0.03	2.34 ± 0.04	2.45 ± 0.04	2.24 ± 0.04	2.41 ± 0.04	2.11 ± 0.05	2.34 ± 0.04	2.03 ± 0.07	2.27± 0.06	P<0.001
# of patients	492	489	456	462	410	430	353	387	230	306	

Abbreviations: Con., conservative; Lib., liberal; #, number; PEEP, positive end expiratory pressure; LIS, lung injury score (17), range is 0-4 with a lower number indicating better lung function; oxygenation index = (mean airway pressure x FIO_2 / PaO_2) x 100, with a lower number indicating better gas exchange.

Supplemental Table 2c: Metabolic and Renal Values During Fluid Management

Variable	Da	iy 1	Da	ay 2	Da	ay 3	Da	ay 4	Da	ay 7	Р
	Con.	Lib.	Con.	Lib.	Con.	Lib.	Con.	Lib.	Con.	Lib.	
Hemoglobin	10.01±0.07	9.78±0.07	10.13±0.07	9.71±0.07	10.20±0.08	9.74±0.07	10.24 ± 0.08	9.71 ± 0.07	10.22 ± 0.09	9.65 ± 0.07	p<0.001
(gm/dL)	493	484	479	469	470	464	432	439	388	411	
# of											
patients	0.40.0.00	0.07.0.00	0.44.0.05	4.05.0.00	0.01.0.00		0.00.005	4.00.004	0.00.004	0.11.0.00	0.001
Albumin	2.13±0.03	2.07±0.03	2.11±0.05	1.95±0.03	2.21±0.03	2.02±0.03	2.26 ± 0.05	1.96 ± 0.04	2.30 ± 0.04	2.11 ± 0.03	p<0.001
(gmj/aL)	439	418	219	223	400	403	195	205	280	339	
# 01											
	15 75+0 22	15 18+0 20	16 58+0 30	15 00+0 25	17 31+0 25	15 7/+0 10	17.04 ± 0.38	15 71 + 0 26	10.18 ± 0.34	17 30 + 0 26	n<0.001
Ha)	436	415	208	211	384	305	17.94 ± 0.30	106	268	17.39 ± 0.20 318	p<0.001
# of	400	410	200	211	004	000	175	100	200	010	
patients											
PAD-COP	6.17±0.62	7.74±0.54	4.90±0.87	7.84±0.79	3.53±0.68	6.49±0.54	2.24 ± 1.03	5.23 ± 1.00	-0.68 ± 1.18	4.28 ± 0.86	p<0.001
(mm Hg)	202	197	96	98	167	176	73	78	56	75	
# of											
patients											
Sodium	139.46±0.24	140.12±0.25	140.49±0.26	140.86±0.25	141.31±0.28	141.27±0.27	141.62 ± 0.30	141.65 ± 0.29	140.72±0.31	140.72 ± 0.31	p=0.94
(mEq/L)	493	488	479	471	474	468	436	438	394	420	
# Of											
Deteccium	2 90 10 02	2 0 9 1 0 0 2	2 90 10 02	2 05 10 02	2 70 10 02	2 02 0 02	2.94 + 0.02	2 02 1 0 02	2.04 + 0.02	4 02 + 0 02	n=0.001
(mEq/L)	3.09±0.03	3.90±0.03	3.00±0.03	3.95±0.03	3.79±0.03	3.92±0.03	3.04 ± 0.03	5.92 ± 0.05	3.94 ± 0.03	4.03 ± 0.03	p=0.001
(IIIEq/E) # of	434	400	401	4/1	470	403	450	441	393	420	
patients.											
Bicarbonate	24.31±0.26	22.91±0.23	26.32±0.29	23.92±0.25	27.85±0.30	25.05±0.26	28.38 ± 0.31	26.03 ± 0.27	28.83 ± 0.34	27.13 ± 0.28	p<0.001
(mEql/L)	490	484	466	467	463	461	420	426	369	399	
# of											
patients											
BUN	25.29±0.90	25.12±0.82	28.47±1.02	25.95±0.87	30.00±1.07	26.57±0.91	32.16±1.05	27.17±0.95	33.62±1.24	28.44 ± 1.09	p=0.009
(mg/dL)	488	484	473	467	474	467	436	436	395	418	
# OT											
Creatinine	1 31+0 05	1 35+0 05	1 43+0 05	1 32+0 05	1 44+0 06	1 26+0 05	1 38+0 06	1 23+0 05	1 31+0 06	1 20 + 0.05	n=0.07
(mg/dL)	488	487	474	470	475	468	437	439	396	420	p-0.07
# of											
patients											

Abbreviations: Con., conservative; Lib., liberal; #, number; PAD, pulmonary artery diastolic pressure; COP, calculated colloid osmotic pressure (21)

Supplemental Table 3: Hospital Mortality, Ventilator and ICU Free Days to Day 28 for Those with or without Shock at Baseline

	Non	Shock	Sh	ock
Organ System	Conservative	Liberal	Conservative	Liberal
60 Day Hospital Mortality	19.4%	23.6%	38.7%	36.9%
Ventilator Free Days (day 28)	16.1 ± 0.6	13.4 ± 0.6	11.2 ± 0.8	10.0 ± 0.8
ICU Free Days (day 28)	14.7 ± 0.5	12.3 ± 0.5	10.5 ± 0.8	9.4 ± 0.7

* Overall hospital mortality was higher and ventilator free days and ICU free days were fewer in patients with shock at baseline (p<0.001 for all comparisons)

**A test for interaction of baseline shock and the treatment effect of fluid therapy was not significant for hospital survival (interaction p value = 0.33), Ventilator free days (p=0.18) or ICU free days (p=0.30)



Supplemental Figure 1.Cumulative Fluid Balance



Supplemental Figure 2a. Intravascular Pressures Over Time: CVP (mmHg)

Supplemental Figure 2b. Intravascular Pressures Over Time: PAOP (mmHg)



FACTT Algorithm: Composite Protocol and Footnotes

	Intravascul	ar Pressur	e	MAP < 60 mm Hg	(Dop	MAP ≥ 60 mm Hg AN pamine <u><</u> 5 mcg/kg/m	ID off vasopressor nin is <i>not</i> a vasopre	s essor)
С	VP	PA	OP ^G	dopamine >5	Average UOP	< 0.5 ml/kg/hr	Average UO	P ≥ 0.5 ml/kg/hr
onservative	beral	onservative	beral	mcg/kg/min or any dose of another vasopressor. Consider correctable causes	Ineffective Circulation C.I. < 2.5 OR Cold & mottled with capillary refill	Effective Circulation C.I. ≥ 2.5 OR Absence of ineffective	Ineffective Circulation C.I. < 2.5 OR Cold & mottled with capillary refill	Effective Circulation C.I. ≥ 2.5 OR Absence of ineffective circulation
Ŭ		Ŭ		of shock first.	>2 sec	circulation criteria	> 2 sec	criteria
	Rar	nge l		Cell number	KVO IV 3	KVO IV 7	KVO IV 11	KVO IV 15
					Dobutamine Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	Furosemide	Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}	Furosemide
> 13	> 18	> 18	> 24	1				
	Ran	ge II		F	KVO IV 4 Dobutamine ^A	KVO IV 8 Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 12 Dobutamine ^A	KVO IV 16 Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}
9-13	15-18	13-18	19-24	Vasopressor' Fluid bolus ^F				
	Ran	ge III		2	Fluid bolus ^C 5	Fluid bolus ^C 9	Fluid bolus ^C 13	Liberal: 17 KVO IV
			Su to	perscript-refers				Conservative: 18
4-8	10-14	8-12	14-18					Furosenniae
	Ran	ge IV		Fluid bolus ^F	Fluid bolus ^C 6	Fluid bolus ^C 10	Fluid bolus ^C 14	Liberal: 19 Fluid bolus
< 4	< 10	< 8	< 14	vasopressor				Conservative: KVO IV 20

Prospective, Randomized, Multi-center Trial of Pulmonary Artery Catheter (PAC) vs. Central Venous Catheter (CVC) for Management of Acute Lung Injury (ALI) and Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) and Prospective, Randomized, Multi-center Trial of "Fluid Conservative" vs. "Fluid Liberal" Management of Acute Lung Injury and Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome: Protocol dated 7/31/2001

Footnotes

A. Dobutamine:

- Start at 5 mcg/kg/min and increase by 5 mcg/kg/min increments at 15 minute intervals until ineffective circulation reversed (CI greater than or equal to 2.5 for PAC or fewer than 3 physical findings of ineffective circulation for CVP) or maximum dose of 20 mcg/kg/min reached.
- 2. Begin weaning 4 hours after ineffective circulation is reversed. Wean by greater than or equal to 25% of the stabilizing dose at intervals of less than or equal to 4 hours to maintain effective circulation
- 3. If a patient is on dobutamine as a result of an earlier cell assignment, dobutamine should be ignored for the purpose of subsequent cell assignment, but should continue to be weaned per protocol.
- B. Furosemide

If the protocol instructs the use of furosemide, and furosemide is unavailable, then bumetanide should be substituted for furosemide, with a dose equivalency ratio of 40:1 (40mg of furosemide = 1 mg of bumetanide). As the protocol allows with furosemide, bumetanide can be delivered either via bolus or continuous infusion at the discretion of the physicians caring for the patient. If and when furosemide becomes available again, furosemide should be utilized to carry out protocol instructions.

- 1. Withhold if:
 - a. vasopressor or a fluid bolus given last 12 hours OR
 - b. renal failure present (dialysis dependence)* OR
 - c. oliguria with creatinine >3, OR
 - d. oliguria with creatinine 0-3 and urinary studies indicative of acute renal failure.
- 2. For cells 3, 7, and 8:

Begin continuous infusion of 3 mg/hour **OR** 20 mg bolus **OR** last known protocol specified effective dose. Reassess in 1 hour. Double dose hourly until urine output is greater than or equal to 0.5 ml/kg/hour **OR** maximum infusion of 24 mg/hour or maximum bolus of 160 mg is reached. Discontinue furosemide if no response

Prospective, Randomized, Multi-center Trial of Pulmonary Artery Catheter (PAC) vs. Central Venous Catheter (CVC) for Management of Acute Lung Injury (ALI) and Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) and Prospective, Randomized, Multi-center Trial of "Fluid Conservative" vs. "Fluid Liberal" Management of Acute Lung Injury and Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome: Protocol dated 7/31/2001

FOOTNOTES

to maximum dose after 1 hour.

- For cells 11, 15, 16, 18: Begin continuous infusion of 3 mg/hour OR 20 mg bolus OR last known protocol specified effective dose. Reassess in 4 hours; if still in a cell for which furosemide is indicated then:
 - a. If intravascular pressure has declined by one or more pressure ranges (rows) repeat the same dose as before, and then reassess in 4 hours.
 - b. If intravascular pressure range has not declined by one or more pressure ranges (rows), and if average urine output over the preceding four hours is less than or equal to 3ml/kg/hr, double the preceding dose and reassess in 4 hours. If average urine output over the preceding four hours is greater than 3ml/kg/hr, then give the same dose as before and reassess within four hours. Maximum daily infusion dose = 24 mg/hour x 12 hours (3 four hour cycles); maximum bolus dose = 160 mg q 4 hours x 3 doses.
- 4. If either the maximum daily infusion (24mg/hr x 12 hrs) or maximum bolus dose sequence (160 mg x 3) is given, then do not give additional furosemide doses for 12 hours following the end of the 12 hour infusion or for 12 hours after the third 160 mg bolus.
- . If at least one cell has passed that does NOT call for Lasix to be given, or at least 12 hours has passed from a sequence of maximum furosemide dosing, you can either start back at 20 mg, give the last known effective dose, or give any dose in between (as determined by the ICU team).
- C. Fluid Bolus (Non-shock, except cell #19):
 - 1. Administer 15 ml/kg PBW normal saline, Plasmalyte, or Ringer's lactate (rounded to the NEAREST 250 cc) or 1 unit of RBCs or 25 grams albumin (choice at discretion of physician) over less than or equal to 1 hour then reassess patient . For cells 5,6,9,10, reassess within one hour. For cells 13,14,19, reassess within four hours. Administer up to 3 boluses over 24 hours if indicated by protocol. This 24 hour period begins with the first protocol-mandated non-shock bolus OR the first protocol-mandated bolus following shock reversal.
 - 2. Additional fluid boluses are allowed at the discretion of the physician.
- D. Fluid Bolus (Cell #19 only):
 - 1. Withhold fluid bolus if: Cardiac index (CI) is greater than or equal to 4.5 **OR** FiO2 is greater than or equal to 0.7.

FOOTNOTES

- 2. Use 15 ml/kg PBW normal saline, Plasmalyte, or Ringer's lactate (rounded to the NEAREST 250 cc) or 1 unit of RBCs or 25 grams albumin (physicians discretion) over less than or equal to 1 hour then reassess patient within 4 hours. Administer up to 3 boluses over 24 hours if indicated by protocol. This 24 hour period begins with the first protocol-mandated non-shock bolus OR the first protocol-mandated bolus following shock reversal.
- 3. Additional fluid boluses are allowed at the discretion of the physician.

E. KVO IV:

- 1. Also minimize as much as possible all other fluid volume (e.g., for delivery of antibiotics etc.), except as required for nutrition support.
- F. Guidelines for Management of Shock:
 - Shock is defined as a MAP < 60 mmHg or a MAP > 60 while receiving vasopressors.
 - Assessments during shock should be recorded at least every 4 hours and at the time of each new entry or exit from a shock cell (cells 1 and 2).
 - Physicians have the choice of either fluid bolus and/or vasopressor therapy (in any order) as follows:

1. Fluid Bolus (Shock):

Use 15 ml/kg PBW normal saline, Plasmalyte, or Ringers (rounded to the NEAREST 250 cc) or 1 unit of RBCs or 25 grams albumin (physicians discretion) over less than or equal to 1 hour then reassess patient.

2. Vasopressor Therapy:

Choice of any single agent or any combination of the following:

- a. Dopamine 5 mcg/kg/min, increase to a maximum of 25 mcg/kg/min.
- b. Norepinephrine at 1 mcg/min, increase to a maximum of 100 mcg/min.
- c. Epinephrine at 1 mcg/min, increase to a maximum of 20 mcg/min.
- d. Phenylephrine at 10 mcg/min, increase to a maximum of 500 mcg/min.
- e. Intravenous Vasopressin 0.005-0.04 international units/minute

3. Vasopressor Weaning (includes any dose of dopamine):

FOOTNOTES

a. When MAP > 60 mmHg on a stable dose of vasopressor,

begin reduction of the vasopressor by greater than or equal to 25% of the stabilizing dose at intervals of less than or equal to 4 hours to maintain MAP greater than or equal to 60 mmHg.

- b. Dopamine is considered "discontinued" for vasopressor use and cell assignment when it is weaned to less than or equal to 5 mcg/kg/min, but should continue to be weaned per protocol (footnote F.3.a. above).
- G. Invalid PAOP
 - 1. If a valid PAOP measurement cannot be obtained, use the pulmonary artery diastolic pressure to estimate the PAOP, based upon the most recently available relationship between PAOP and PADP, and assuming a stable arithmetic difference between the two values. For example, if the most recent prior valid measurements showed a PAOP = 10 and a PADP = 15, and the current PADP = 20 and a valid PAOP cannot be obtained, then assume a current PAOP = 15.
 - 2. If neither a valid PAOP nor PADP can be obtained, then utilize the current CVP value.
- * Renal Failure
 - a. Dialysis dependence is defined as the period from the initiation of dialysis to the time that continuous dialysis is discontinued or to the time following the last session of intermittent dialysis.
 - b. During this period of dialysis dependence, urine output is considered to be adequate for the purposes of cell assignment.

Prospective, Randomized, Multi-Center Trial of Pulmonary Artery Catheter (PAC) vs. Central Venous Catheter (CVC) for Management of Acute Lung Injury (ALI) and Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS).

and

Prospective, Randomized, Multi-Center Trial of "Fluid Conservative" vs. "Fluid Liberal" Management of Acute Lung Injury (ALI) and Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS).

> ARDS Clinical Network ARDSNet Study #05, Version II Footnote, Version IV

> > July 31, 2001



Contents

\mathbf{St}	udy	Summary	6
Ι	Stu	ıdy Summary	6
II	\mathbf{St}	udy Description	11
1	BA	CKGROUND	11
2	Obj	ectives	14
3	End	lpoints	16
	3.1	Primary Endpoint	16
	3.2	Secondary Endpoints	16
4	\mathbf{Stu}	dy Population and Enrollment	17
	4.1	Number/Source/Screening	17
	4.2	Inclusion Criteria	18
	4.3	Exclusion Criteria	18
	4.4	Enrollment and Study Initiation Time Window	20
	4.5	Informed Consent	20
	4.6	Randomization	20
	4.7	Minorities/Women	21

5	\mathbf{PR}	PROCEDURES 2					
	5.1	Insertion of the Catheter and Acquisition of Data	21				
	5.2	Infection Monitoring	23				
	5.3	Clinical Management	23				
	5.4	Treatment Algorithm Validation	23				
	5.5	Duration of Protocol	24				
	5.6	Schedule of Hemodynamic Management Events	25				
	5.7	Ventilator Management	25				
6	Dat	Data Collection					
	6.1	Background Assessments	25				
	6.2	Baseline Assessments	26				
	6.3	Assessments During Study	27				
7	Sta	Statistical Considerations					
	7.1	Early Stopping and Monitoring	30				
8	Ris	Risk Assessment 3					
9	9 Data Collection and Site Monitoring						
	9.1	Data Collection	32				
	9.2	Site Monitoring	33				
10	10 Human Subjects						
11	11 Adverse Event Reporting						
FA	FACTT Study Version II 3						

FACTT Staty Version Footnote, Version IV ARDSNet Study 05 July 31, 2001

12	12 Schedule of Events 13 Appendices						
13							
\mathbf{A}	A Composite Fluid Protocol Table						
в	Foo	tnotes	, Version IV	41			
С	Ven	tilator	Procedures	44			
	C.1	Volum	e Cycled Ventilation	44			
		C.1.1	Ventilator mode:	44			
		C.1.2	Tidal Volume and Ventilator Rate Adjustments and Arterial pH Management.	44			
		C.1.3	Inspiratory flow and I:E ratio	46			
		C.1.4	Oxygenation.	46			
		C.1.5	Simultaneous changes	48			
	C.2	Weani	ng	49			
		C.2.1	Commencement of Weaning	49			
		C.2.2	Initial Pressure Support (PS) Setting	50			
		C.2.3	Assessment for Tolerance	50			
		C.2.4	Subsequent ventilator settings	51			
		C.2.5	Assess for ability to sustain unassisted breathing	51			
	C.3	Definit	tion of unassisted breathing	52			
	C.4	Compl	letion of ventilator procedures	52			
	C.5	Prema	ture Withdrawal from Treatment.	52			

D	Adverse Events	53		
\mathbf{E}	Genetic Testing Procedures			
	E.1 Sample Collection for genetic testing	56		
\mathbf{F}	Exclusion Definitions	57		

Part I

Study Summary

• **Titles:** Prospective, Randomized, Multi-Center Trial of Pulmonary Artery Catheter (PAC) vs. Central Venous Catheter (CVC) for Management of Acute Lung Injury (ALI) and Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS).

and

Prospective, Randomized, Multi-Center Trial of "Fluid Conservative" vs. "Fluid Liberal" Management of Acute Lung Injury (ALI) and Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS).

- Objectives:
 - 1. To assess the safety and efficacy of PAC vs. CVC management in reducing mortality and morbidity in patients with ALI and ARDS.
 - 2. To assess the safety and efficacy of "fluid conservative" vs. "fluid liberal" management strategies in reducing mortality and morbidity in patients with ALI and ARDS.
- Study Design: Multi-center, prospective, randomized, controlled clinical trials. Patients will be randomized into each of the two trials simultaneously (factorial design).
 - 1. A maximum of about 1,000 patients will be enrolled.
 - 2. Patients will be treated with the specific fluid management strategy (to which they were randomized) for 7 days or until unassisted ventilation, whichever occurs first.
 - 3. Patients randomized to PAC will utilize this catheter for at least 3 days and up to 7 days (depending on protocol defined stability criteria) or until unassisted ventilation, whichever occurs first. If the PAC is discontinued according to protocol between day 3 and day 7, the fluid management strategy will continue (until day 7 or unassisted ventilation, whichever occurs first) and will be guided by the CVC.

4. Patients randomized to CVC will utilize this catheter for 7 days or until unassisted ventilation, whichever occurs first.

• Sample Size/Interim Monitoring:

- 1. This study uses a 2x2 factorial design comparing the use of a liberal fluid management strategy and a conservative fluid management strategy and comparing the use of the PAC to the use of the CVC. The trial will accrue a total of about 1,000 patients (about 250 patients in each of the four groups) providing about 500 patients treated with PAC to be compared against about 500 patients treated with CVC and about 500 patients treated with a fluid conservative strategy. This provides 90% power to detect a difference of 10% (from 31% to 21%) in mortality at day 60 in the two primary comparisons using a two sided p=.05 significance level. The principal analysis will be intent-to-treat, based upon randomization assignment.
- 2. Either comparison may be stopped independently if the difference between the mortality rates of the two treatments is greater than the O'Brien-Fleming boundary. We will also monitor for an interaction between the two factors using a Pocock boundary. The trial will be monitored after each 200 patients.
- 3. The trial will also be monitored by the steering committee for feasibility. Feasibility parameters will include accrual, the ability to follow the fluid management protocols, separation of the groups based on fluid balance data, and the frequency that a PAC is placed in the group that is randomized to CVC ("crossover"). If any of these parameters indicate that the trial is not feasible, the trial will be modified or terminated.

• Inclusion Criteria:

Acute Onset of:

- 1. $PaO_2/FiO_2 \le 300$. If altitude > 1000m, then $PaO_2/FiO_2 \le 300$ x (PB/760).
- 2. Bilateral infiltrates consistent with pulmonary edema on frontal chest radiograph. The infiltrates may be patchy, diffuse , homogeneous, or asymmetric.

- 3. Requirement for positive pressure ventilation via endotracheal tube.
- 4. No clinical evidence of left atrial hypertension.

Criteria 1-4 must occur together within a 24-hour interval.

"Acute Onset" is defined as follows: the duration of the hypoxemia criterion (#1) and the chest radiograph criterion (#2) must be ≤ 28 days at the time of randomization.

• Exclusion Criteria:

- 1. Absence of current intent or ability on the part of the treating physician(s) to obtain or continue central venous access (that could be used for either CVC or PAC monitoring) as part of regular care of this patient.
- 2. Unwillingness or inability to utilize the low tidal volume (6ml/kg PBW) ventilator management protocol.
- 3. Presence of a PAC at any time after onset of ALI (meeting of inclusion criteria 1-4).
- 4. > 48 hours since onset of ALI (meeting of inclusion criteria 1-4).
- 5. Age <13 years.
- 6. Burns > 40% body surface area.
- 7. Not committed to full support (Exception: a patient will not be excluded if he/she would receive all supportive care except for attempts at resuscitation from cardiac arrest).
- 8. Bone marrow transplantation.
- 9. Acute myocardial infarction within the last 30 days.
- 10. Severe chronic respiratory disease:
 - (a) FEV₁ less than 20 ml/kg PBW (e.g., 1.4 L for 70 kg), or
 - (b) FEV_1/VC less than 50% predicted, or
 - (c) Chronic hypercapnia (PaCO₂ greater than 45 mmHg) and/or chronic hypoxemia (PaO₂ < 55 mmHg) on FiO₂ = 0.21, or
 - (d) Radiographic evidence of chronic over-inflation or chronic interstitial infiltration, or

- (e) Hospitalization within the past six months for respiratory failure (PaCO₂ > 50 mmHg or PaO₂ < 55 mmHg or O₂-Sat < 88% on FiO₂ = .21).
- (f) Chronic restrictive, obstructive, neuromuscular, chest wall or pulmonary vascular disease resulting in severe exercise restriction, *e.g.*, unable to climb stairs or perform household duties, secondary polycythemia, severe pulmonary hypertension (mean > 40 mmHg), or ventilator dependency.
- 11. Neuromuscular disease that impairs ability to ventilate spontaneously, such as C5 or higher spinal cord injury, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, Guillain-Barre Syndrome, and myasthenia gravis.
- 12. Morbid obesity (> 1 kg/cm body weight).
- 13. Malignancy or other irreversible disease or condition for which 6 month mortality is estimated to be $\geq 50\%$.
- 14. Vasculitis with diffuse alveolar hemorrhage.
- 15. Pregnancy (negative pregnancy test required for women of child-bearing potential).
- 16. Renal failure requiring renal replacement therapy.
- 17. Severe, chronic liver disease (Child-Pugh Score of 10-15, see Appendix F).
- 18. Furosemide allergy.
- 19. Lung transplantation.
- Enrollment and Study Initiation Time Window: All patients must be randomized within 48 hours of meeting inclusion criterion for ALI (inclusion criteria 1-4). The last inclusion criterion may be met at either the Network hospital or a referring hospital. Following randomization, the low tidal volume protocol for mechanical ventilation must be initiated within one hour (if not already being utilized). The appropriate catheter (PAC or CVC, based upon randomization) must be in place within four hours of randomization. Finally, initiation of the fluid management protocol (fluid liberal or fluid conservative, based upon randomization) must begin within two hours of the time of placement of the PAC or CVC.
- Efficacy: The primary efficacy variable is mortality prior to hospital discharge to 60 days. The major secondary efficacy variables include:

1) ventilator free days, which is the number of days of unassisted breathing after initiating spontaneous breathing to day 28, and 2) number of organ-failure-free days at day 28 after randomization. Several other secondary efficacy variables will be analyzed, as well, as outlined in the protocol.

Part II

Study Description

Prospective, Randomized, Multi-Center Trial of Pulmonary Artery Catheter (PAC) vs. Central Venous Catheter (CVC) for Management of Acute Lung Injury (ALI) and Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS). and Prospective, Randomized, Multi-Center Trial of "Fluid

Conservative" vs. "Fluid Liberal" Management of Acute Lung Injury (ALI) and Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS). Protocol for the NIH ARDS Network

1 BACKGROUND

The pulmonary arterial catheter (PAC) was introduced for clinical use in 1970 to provide diagnostic and monitoring information not available from other clinical sources [1]. An amendment to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) act in 1976 charged the FDA with the responsibility for insuring the safety and effectiveness of medical devices. The PAC has been designated as a Class II device, one that requires special controls. Approximately 1.5 million such catheters are sold in the United States annually. Estimates indicate that 30% of PACs are used in cardiac surgery, 30% in cardiac catheterization laboratories and coronary care units, 25% in high risk surgery and trauma, and 15% in medical intensive care units (personal communication, Baxter Healthcare Corporation).

Observational studies and anecdotal reports of morbidity and mortality associated with and directly related to the catheter [2]-[8] culminated in a multi-institutional, case matched, statistically sophisticated study of 9 disease categories of patients by Connors et al. [9]. The fundamental question raised by the Connors article, as well as by previous reports, relates to "implied harm" that may be associated with use of the PAC.
Implied harm is defined as the excess morbidity and mortality found in these reports, but for which there is no discernible cause and effect relationship to the insertion or presence of the PAC. No prospective randomized studies directly relate increased morbidity and mortality to the insertion of the PAC, but a few prior studies infer that operational problems, errors in data interpretation, inappropriate therapeutic responses to catheter data, singly or in combination, result in no benefit to patients and may actually harm them [2]-[9].

The PAC provides a wealth of direct and indirect information about circulatory and respiratory systems and intravascular fluid volume over time. Specifically, the PAC allows measurement of central venous and pulmonary arterial pressure, pulmonary artery occlusion pressure (PAOP, or "wedge" pressure), mixed venous blood gases, and indicator-dilution cardiac output. Because the data are quantitative, more information, such as systemic and pulmonary vascular resistance, can be derived. The accuracy of these measurement is high in expert hands [10, 11], but is subject to proper placement of the catheter, calibration of transducers and user interpretation of wave forms and data [12, 13]. PAC data, properly interpreted, help to assess right and left ventricle function, intracardiac shunts, pulmonary ventilatory function and intra-vascular fluid status [14, 15]. Once the PAC is in place and is properly maintained, ongoing monitoring of these data may provide early information regarding trends toward improvement or deterioration [8] in response to the rapeutic intervention [15]. No other monitoring system provides as much overall information for management of circulatory and respiratory inadequacy or for assessing intravascular fluid volume.

Direct morbidity and mortality associated with the PAC is related to complications from insertion, passage, and maintenance of the catheter. Such complications include pneumothorax, bleeding (hemothorax, etc.), arrhythmias, thromboembolism, pulmonary artery rupture, and infection [17, 20]. The incidence of these direct complications has been widely reported [17]; a consensus of experts estimates that serious complications occur in 0.1-0.5% of monitored surgical patients [15, 17, 18]. Ongoing observational studies are expected to better document the incidence of direct complications associated with the use of the PA catheter.

Morbidity and mortality may also result from misinterpretation or misapplication of data derived from the PAC. The insertion, use and

interpretation of data obtained from PACs requires special expertise that is not possessed by all health care professionals [12, 13]. Connors et al. [9] have also reported significant variability in the prevalence of PAC use across institutions even within patient disease groups that should be relatively homogenous.

Although there have been multiple calls for investigation [21, 22, 23], no definitive, randomized, prospective clinical trials designed to determine the safety and efficacy of the PAC in medical and surgical patients exist [15, 24]. The use of the PAC can be divided into diagnostic and management applications. In most cases, diagnostic applications require the catheter to be inserted for brief periods of time (less than 24 hours). The complication rates for these diagnostic studies are well documented and relate primarily to the insertion procedure or the catheter itself [12, 15]. On the other hand, the management issues related to the PAC are less well investigated.

The PAC catheter is used commonly in patients with acute lung injury (ALI) and its most severe subset, the acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS). ALI is a clinical problem of significant magnitude in terms of incidence (150,000 patients per year), mortality (30%-60% in most series) and cost (in part due to long stays in intensive care). In patients with ALI, the PAC has been employed widely both to confirm the diagnosis as well as to optimize hemodynamic management. However, there are no prospective data that establish the clinical risk/benefit ratio of use of the PAC in such patients. Although the data obtained from the PAC provides considerable physiologic information about the systemic and pulmonary derangements that occur in patients with ALI [25], it is not clear that such information improves therapy or clinical outcomes. Mitchell and co-workers [26] randomized 52 ARDS patients (already being managed with PAC) to either a extravascular lung water (EVLW) management (based on bedside indicator-dilution measurements) or a "routine" wedge pressure management group. The EVLW management strategy achieved both a lower overall net fluid balance and a lower extravascular lung water, and was associated with improved mortality and shorter ICU length of stay. This study suggests that achieving a lower fluid balance in ARDS patients is associated with improved clinical outcomes. In a retrospective study of 40 ARDS patients, those patients who experienced a reduction of wedge pressure of at least 25 percent during acute management (first 48 hours) were found to have better survival than those patients who did not

experience such a reduction in wedge pressure (75% vs. 29% survival, p < 0.02) [27].

Theoretically, measurement of the PAOP and cardiac output may make it possible for physicians to maintain pulmonary vascular pressures at a lower level, thus reducing the quantity of pulmonary edema that may develop in the presence of an increase in lung vascular permeability [25, 28]. Also, maintaining a lower pulmonary capillary pressure may prevent or minimize damage ("stress failure") to the capillary wall [29]. In normal animals, high pulmonary capillary pressure causes ultrastructural damage to the capillary walls, with a resulting "high permeability" (capillary leak) type of edema [29]. Of interest, a high concentration of leukotriene B_4 and inflammatory cells is also found in the bronchoalveolar lavage of these animals, suggesting the onset of an inflammatory process [29]. Such inflammation may be triggered by exposure of the highly reactive endothelial basement membrane [29].

Furthermore, the measurement of pulmonary arterial pressure and cardiac output may make it possible for physicians to administer vasoactive agents more skillfully in order to optimize cardiac output, maintain or improve renal function, and increase systemic blood pressure and blood flow to vital organs [25]. On the other hand, it is possible that measurement of central venous pressure alone using a central venous catheter (CVC) is adequate to optimize hemodynamics in patients with ALI. The issue can only be resolved with carefully designed prospective studies [30, 31]. Further, a well designed trial, complete with supporting clinical protocols, could be a model for other interventional studies of ALI specifically and critical care in general. Such a trial also has the advantage of systematically collecting data on the incidence of volume overload pulmonary edema in patients clinically thought to have ALI and evaluating how this information changes clinical management and outcome in prospective randomized trial.

2 Objectives

- 1. Primary Objectives:
 - Evaluate the impact of the pulmonary artery catheter (PAC) versus the central venous catheter (CVC) on mortality, ventilator-free days, and organ failure in patients with Acute

Lung Injury (ALI).

- Evaluate the impact of a fluid conservative management strategy versus a fluid liberal management strategy on mortality, ventilator-free days, and organ failures in patients with Acute Lung Injury (ALI).
- 2. Primary Hypotheses:
 - Use of the PAC will be associated with a reduction in 60-day mortality.
 - Use of the fluid conservative management strategy will be associated with a reduction in 60-day mortality.
- 3. Secondary Hypotheses:
 - Use of the PAC will significantly reduce the duration of assisted ventilation (as measured over 28 days). Use of the fluid conservative strategy will significantly reduce the duration of assisted ventilation (as measured over 28 days).
 - Use of the PAC compared to that of the CVC will reduce the extent of multiple organ system dysfunction including liver function, hematologic function, gastrointestinal function (need for packed red cell transfusion), and an overall organ system dysfunction index (using the Brussels table) by day 7. Use of the fluid conservative strategy compared to that of the fluid liberal strategy will reduce the extent of multiple organ system dysfunction including liver function, hematologic function, gastrointestinal function (need for packed red cell transfusion), and an overall organ system dysfunction index (using the Brussels table) by day 7.
 - Use of the PAC will be associated with a significant reduction in the lung injury score, the PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio, and/or the oxygenation index on days 1 through 7 after randomization compared to patients with a CVC.
 Use of the fluid conservative strategy will be associated with a significant reduction in the lung injury score, the PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio, and/or the oxygenation index on days 1 through 7 after randomization compared to patients with a fluid liberal strategy.
 - The incidence of major complications (pneumothorax, catheter-related infection, and arrhythmias) will be the same for the PAC and the CVC.

3 Endpoints

3.1 Primary Endpoint

1. Mortality prior to hospital discharge to day 60.

3.2 Secondary Endpoints

- 1. Number of ventilator-free days (VFD) to day 28 after enrollment.
- 2. Number of ICU-free days at 7 and 28 days after enrollment.
- 3. Number of organ failure-free days at 7 and 28 days after enrollment.
- 4. Resource utilization (estimated from event-free days).
- 5. Number of complications associated with PAC and CVC (pneumothorax, catheter-related bacteremia or fungemia, and arrhythmias) while the catheters are in place.
- 6. Reduction of the PaO_2/FiO_2 ratio on days 1-7 after catheter insertion.
- 7. Improvement in Lung Injury Score on days 1-7 after catheter insertion.
- 8. Correlation between the pulmonary artery wedge pressure and the central venous pressure while the PAC and CVC are in place.
- 9. Changes in fluid therapy, use of vasoactive agents, and/or diuretics within the first 1-7 days after insertion of a PAC versus a CVC.
- 10. Correlation between PAC measure of cardiac output and clinical measures of skin temperature, capillary refill, and skin mottling and relationship to protocol driven interventions.

VFD to day 28 is defined as the number of days of unassisted breathing to day 28 after randomization, assuming a patient survives for at least two consecutive calendar days after initiating unassisted breathing and remains free of assisted breathing. If a patient returns to assisted breathing and subsequently achieves unassisted breathing prior to day 28, VFD will be counted from the end of the last period of assisted breathing to day 28 unless a period of assisted breathing was less than 24 hours and the purpose of assisted breathing was a surgical procedure. If the patient is receiving assisted ventilation at day 28 or dies prior to day 28, VFD will be 0. Unassisted breathing is defined as breathing with face mask or nasal prong oxygen (or room air) following extubation, T-tube breathing, breathing with continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP $\leq 5 \text{ cm H}_2\text{O}$), or tracheotomy mask breathing.

Organ failure is defined as present on any date when the most abnormal vital signs/abnormal lab value meets the definition of clinically significant organ failure according to the Brussels Organ Failure Table. Patients will be followed for 7 days. Blood tests will be obtained on days 1-7 in order that the presence of clinically significant organ failure can be assessed. Each day a patient is alive and free of a given clinically significant organ failure will be scored as a failure-free day. Any day that a patient is alive and free of all 5 organ failures will represent days alive and free of all organ failure. Central nervous system dysfunction is evaluated using the Glasgow Coma Scale.

Bacteremia and fungemia are defined as isolation from one or more blood cultures of pathogenic bacteria, yeast or fungi with the exception of coagulase negative (or thermonuclease negative) Staphylococci or Corynebacteria. Coagulase negative Staphylococci or Corynebacterium bacteremia require the isolation of these organisms from at least two blood cultures drawn within 24 hours of each other containing the same organism in order to be deemed significant. Bacteremia and fungemia are considered catheter-related if they occur when the same organism is quantitatively cultured (> 15 cfu) from a catheter tip (confirmed) or when, in the opinion of the patient's physician, the infection can only have been caused by the catheter (non-confirmed).

4 Study Population and Enrollment

4.1 Number/Source/Screening

Approximately 1,000 patients will be enrolled over a 3 year interval. Patients with ALI will be sought in the NIH ARDSNet intensive care units. Study Coordinators at each site will visit each intensive care unit daily to identify potential candidates for enrollment. Permission to approach patients/families will be requested from attending physicians. All patients meeting the inclusion criteria will be entered on a screening log. If the patient is not enrolled, the screening log will include information explaining why enrollment did not occur (exclusion criteria, attending physician denial, patient refusal, etc.).

4.2 Inclusion Criteria

Acute Onset of:

- 1. $\rm PaO_2/FiO_2 < 300.$ If altitude > 1000m, then $\rm PaO_2/FiO_2 \leq 300~x$ (B.P./760).
- 2. Bilateral infiltrates consistent with pulmonary edema on frontal chest radiograph. The infiltrates may be patchy, diffuse, homogeneous, or asymmetric.
- 3. Requirement for positive pressure ventilation via endotracheal tube.
- 4. No clinical evidence of left atrial hypertension.

Criteria 1-4 must occur together within a 24-hour interval.

"Acute Onset" is defined as follows: the duration of the hypoxemia criterion (#1) and the chest radiograph criterion (#2) must be ≤ 28 days at the time of randomization.

4.3 Exclusion Criteria

- 1. Absence of current intent or ability on the part of the treating physician(s) to obtain or continue central venous access (that could be used for either CVC or PAC monitoring) as part of regular care of this patient.
- 2. Unwillingness or inability to utilize the low tidal volume (6ml/kg PBW) ventilator management protocol.

- 3. Presence of a PAC at any time after onset of ALI (meeting of inclusion criteria 1-4).
- 4. > 48 hours since onset of ALI (meeting of inclusion criteria 1-4).
- 5. Age < 13 years.
- 6. Burns > 40% body surface area.
- 7. Not committed to full support (Exception: a patient will not be excluded if he/she would receive all supportive care except for attempts at resuscitation from cardiac arrest).
- 8. Bone marrow transplantation.
- 9. Acute myocardial infarction within the last 30 days.
- 10. Severe chronic respiratory disease:
 - FEV₁ less than 20 ml/kg PBW (e.g., 1.4 L for 70 kg), or
 - FEV₁ /VC less than 50% predicted, or
 - Chronic hypercapnia (PaCO₂ greater than 45 mmHg) and/or chronic hypoxemia (PaO₂ < 55 mmHg) on FiO₂ = 0.21, or
 - Radiographic evidence of chronic over-inflation or chronic interstitial infiltration, or
 - Hospitalization within the past six months for respiratory failure ($PaCO_2 > 50 \text{ mmHg or } PaO_2 < 55 \text{ mmHg or } O_2\text{-Sat} < 88\% \text{ on } FiO_2 = .21$).
 - Chronic restrictive, obstructive, neuromuscular, chest wall or pulmonary vascular disease resulting in severe exercise restriction, *e.g.*, unable to climb stairs or perform household duties, secondary polycythemia, severe pulmonary hypertension (mean PAP > 40 mmHg), or respirator dependency.
- 11. Neuromuscular disease that impairs ability to ventilate spontaneously, such as C5 or higher spinal cord injury, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, Guillain-Barre Syndrome, and myasthenia gravis.
- 12. Morbid obesity (> 1 kg/cm body weight).
- 13. Malignancy or other irreversible disease or condition for which 6 month mortality is estimated to be $\geq 50\%$.

- 14. Vasculitis with diffuse alveolar hemorrhage.
- 15. Pregnancy (negative pregnancy test required for women of child-bearing potential).
- 16. Renal failure requiring renal replacement therapy.
- 17. Severe, chronic liver disease (Child-Pugh Score of 10-15 See Appendix F).
- 18. Furosemide allergy.
- 19. Lung transplantation.

4.4 Enrollment and Study Initiation Time Window

All patients must be randomized within 48 hours of meeting inclusion criterion for ALI (inclusion criteria 1-4). The last inclusion criterion may be met at either the Network hospital or a referring hospital. Following randomization, the low tidal volume protocol for mechanical ventilation must be initiated within one hour (if not already being utilized). The appropriate catheter (PAC or CVC, based upon randomization) must be in place within four hours of randomization. Finally, initiation of the fluid management protocol (fluid liberal or fluid conservative, based upon randomization) must begin within two hours of the time of placement of the PAC or CVC.

4.5 Informed Consent

Informed consent will be obtained from each patient or surrogate prior to enrollment in the trial.

4.6 Randomization

After obtaining informed consent, the Clinical Coordinating Center will be called and an assignment will be made by computer-generated randomization to either the PAC or CVC and to either the fluid conservative or fluid liberal management strategies. The randomization

system will be based on Interactive Voice Response System (I.V.R.S.) technology. Each research coordinator will have a unique Personal Identification Number (PIN). He or she will call the system and be asked to supply the PIN. A treatment assignment and a patient ID number will be assigned. A faxed confirmation will follow to the site.

4.7 Minorities/Women

Gender and racial patient subsets were considered by the NHLBI in selecting the Network Centers. The demographic profiles of the Centers selected for the Network show that the aggregate patient population contains representative proportions of minorities (28%) and women. Recruitment of minorities and women will be monitored by the Network Coordinating Center. If necessary, additional recruitment efforts will be made at specific centers to ensure that the aggregate patient sample contains appropriate gender and minority subsets.

5 PROCEDURES

5.1 Insertion of the Catheter and Acquisition of Data

The patient will be randomized to receive either PAC (which includes the CVC port) or a CVC alone. At the time of enrollment, patients will have either central venous access (CVC but not PAC) or it will be the prior intent of the attending physician to attain such access. For patients with no central access at the time of enrollment, central access will be obtained via an internal jugular, subclavian, antecubital, or femoral vein (if the physician is willing to use this site for CVC or PAC). For patients with an existing central venous catheter who are randomized to PAC, the CVC will be changed over a wire to PAC for subsequent PAC placement. Alternatively, a PAC introducer may be placed using a new access site.

The type of CVC or PAC catheter used in this trial will be those already in clinical use in the study ICUs. The minimum requirement for PAC will be the availability of right atrial and distal PA ports as well as a capability to measure thermodilution cardiac output. PACs with continuous cardiac

output monitoring capabilities can be used. The type of catheters (number of ports, continuous cardiac output, etc.), antibiotic coating of catheter/introducer, the site of insertion, the date and duration of insertion will all be recorded on the case report form.

Catheters will be inserted using aseptic technique and full barrier precautions. Catheters will be pre-filled with heparinized saline solutions and the distal balloon will be tested with the injection of 1.5 cc of air followed by passive deflation. The PAC will then be inserted through the PAC introducer and the typical wave forms of the right atrium, right ventricle, pulmonary artery, and PAOP observed on the bed-side monitor. The balloon will then be passively deflated and reinflated to confirm the PAOP. An acceptable PAOP waveform should produce a tracing that is compatible with a left atrial wave form when assessed in reference to a simultaneously recorded electrocardiogram on a strip chart recording and the mean PAOP should be equal to or lower than the PA diastolic pressure. The insertion site will then be secured and dressed per local hospital policy. A chest radiograph will be performed immediately thereafter to confirm proper placement of the CVC and PAC. Location of the catheter tip with the balloon deflated will be as close to the pulmonic valve as possible to avoid technical problems.

Right atrial pressure, PA systolic pressure, PA diastolic pressure, and PAOP will all be measured in reference to the mid-thorax at the 4th intercostal space. Catheter transducer systems will be electronically zeroed to this reference point. Pressure measurements will be made on a 2-channel strip chart recorder that allows simultaneous display of the electrocardiogram and PA or RA wave form. The mean right atrial pressure and mean PAOP will be measured at end expiration. Cardiac output will be measured by thermodilution technique with either iced saline or room temperature saline as per the study ICU's procedures. Thermodilution cardiac outputs will be measured in triplicate and the average of the three injections will be recorded. No attempt will be made to time the injection to the respiratory cycle.

Hemodynamic measurements will be obtained at least every four hours by the nursing personnel in the study intensive care units and the strip chart recordings kept in the ICU. At a randomly selected time each day, the strip chart recording will be reviewed with a member of the study team to confirm accurate measurement of pressure and timing of respiration of the

respiratory cycle. Study personnel and the critical care nurses in the study ICUs will have the Pulmonary Artery Catheter and Clinical Outcomes (PACCO) educational materials and PACCO pre and post-tests available for training at each site.

Material will also be distributed to each site providing standard instructions for assessing capillary refill time, cutaneous "mottling" of the skin over the knees, and skin temperature at the knees.

5.2 Infection Monitoring

The catheter insertion site will be inspected daily. The presence of purulence alone, or erythema with one of the following: tenderness, and increased warmth, induration, lymphangitis, or probable thrombosed vein, will constitute local site inflammation and the catheter will be removed and a new insertion site selected. For patients with fever and other clinical signs of infection, the PAC introducer or the CVC introducer will be changed to a new line or introducer over a wire and the tip quantitatively cultured. For febrile patients with septic shock, the PAC or CVC will be removed and a new insertion site selected unless there is clearly a likely cause of septic shock other than the catheter.

5.3 Clinical Management

Hemodynamic management of patients in each of the four groups (PAC-fluid conservative; PAC-fluid liberal; CVC-fluid conservative; CVC-fluid liberal) will be conducted according to protocol, as provided in Appendix A.

5.4 Treatment Algorithm Validation

Compliance with the hemodynamic protocol instructions and safety of the protocol instructions will be monitored by the PAC committee daily for the first 60 patients (15 in each treatment cell) as part of the protocol evaluation process. During this period, the protocol rules may be refined through iterative application and evaluation in the ARDS Network sites.

The goals for this refinement phase will be to achieve $\sim 90\%$ compliance with instructions with no safety concerns.

Protocol performance data will include percent compliance with the protocol instructions and adverse events. Summary data for the first 60 patients and the revised hemodynamic management protocols will be reviewed by the Steering Committee and the Data and Safety Monitoring Board. The iterative refinement process will continue during Steering Committee and DSMB review. The Steering Committee or the DSMB may ask that the detailed iterative refinement continue beyond sixty patients or recommend that the study proceed with the refined protocol.

5.5 Duration of Protocol

The fluid management strategy (fluid liberal or fluid conservative) will be carried out for 7 days from the time of randomization or until unassisted ventilation is achieved, whichever occurs first.

The PAC will be maintained for at least 3 days, and thereafter until a 24 hour period of hemodynamic stability occurs (defined as the absence of instructions for any of the following interventions by the fluid management strategy: fluid bolus, pressors, inotropes, diuretic) up to a maximum of 7 days or until unassisted ventilation is achieved, whichever occurs first. If the PAC is removed between day 3 and day 7 by the protocol defined stability criterion, a CVC will be maintained and will be utilized to continue the fluid management strategy (conservative vs. liberal) that the patient was initially randomized to.

The CVC will be maintained for 7 days or until unassisted ventilation is achieved, whichever occurs first.

For the purpose of determining the endpoint of protocol application, unassisted ventilation must be continuously achieved for at least 12 consecutive hours, or until discharge of the patient from the intensive care unit, whichever occurs first.

5.6 Schedule of Hemodynamic Management Events

The data that serves as "input" for the fluid management protocol will be obtained at least every 4 hours. In all patients, this includes blood pressure, urine output, clinical assessment of the effectiveness of the arterial circulation, and central venous pressure. In patients with PAC, this additionally includes measurement of pulmonary artery occlusion pressure and cardiac index. Based upon this data, the appropriate protocol "output" (maintenance fluid, bolus fluid, inotrope, diuretic, pressor) will be implemented.

If, prior to the next scheduled 4 hour assessment, a change in one of the data inputs occurs (*e.g.*, decrease in urine output), then the investigator shall have two options. First, it can be determined whether this change would cause a new output instruction, based upon the most recent available full set of data inputs (occlusion pressure, etc.) carried forward. If so, then a full set of data inputs must be obtained (unless less than 30 minutes have elapsed since a particular measurement was last obtained), and then the appropriate output instruction is implemented based upon this new full set of data. Alternatively, the investigator may elect to measure the data inputs at anytime, based upon clinical judgement. In any event, in all circumstances, output instructions will be carried out only based upon an updated full set of data inputs (each element obtained within 30 minutes or less of the output instruction).

5.7 Ventilator Management

(Ventilation management for all patients will be according to the 6 ml/kg protocol of ARDSNet Study 01 - ARMA - See Appendix C)

6 Data Collection

6.1 Background Assessments

- 1. Pregnancy test (serum or urine) for women of child-bearing potential
- 2. Demographic and admission data

- 3. Pertinent medical history and physical examination
- 4. Height; calculated predicted body weight (PBW)
- 5. Time on ventilator prior to enrollment
- 6. Type of admission
 - (a) Medical
 - (b) Surgical scheduled
 - (c) Surgical unscheduled
- 7. Risk factors for ALI/ARDS (sepsis, aspiration, trauma, pneumonia, drug overdose, other)
- 8. Presence of following chronic diseases:
 - (a) Metastatic cancer
 - (b) Hematologic malignancy
 - (c) AIDS

6.2 Baseline Assessments

- 1. Vital signs: heart rate (b/min), systemic systolic and diastolic blood pressure (mm Hg), body temperature (°C)
- 2. Ventilator mode, rate, minute ventilation, tidal volume, FiO₂, PEEP, plateau, peak, and mean airway pressures
- 3. Arterial PO₂, PCO₂, pH, and SpO₂
- 4. Central venous pressure
- 5. Mixed venous PO₂, PCO₂, pH, and SO₂ as well as central venous sample (simultaneous when PA inserted).
- 6. Urinary output (most recent 24 hour value) or mean hourly value for most recently available period
- 7. Serum electrolytes, BUN, creatinine, glucose, albumin, and total protein
- 8. Blood hematocrit/hemoglobin, WBC, and platelets

- 9. Glasgow Coma Score
- 10. Frontal chest radiograph
 - (a) Radiographic lung injury score (# of quadrants)
 - (b) Presence or absence of barotrauma
 - Pneumothoraces (R/L)
 - Pneumomediastinum
 - Pneumatoceles > 2 cm minimum diameter (R/L)
 - Subcutaneous emphysema
- 11. Administration of following medications:
 - (a) Vasopressors
 - (b) Inotropic agent
 - (c) Diuretics
- 12. Presumed site of infection, if sepsis is the etiology of ALI/ARDS.
- 13. Results of special diagnostic studies performed to assess hemodynamic status (*e.g.*, cardiac echocardiogram)
- 14. Signs of the effectiveness of the arterial circulation (e.g., capillary refill time, knee mottling, skin temperature, etc.).
- 15. Intake and output for 24 hours on that calendar date; intake to include types volumes of various fluids (e.g., blood products, colloids, saline solutions
- 16. Evidence of anasarca (physical exam).
- 17. Blood for cytokines, mediators, and markers of lung injury. Plasma obtained from two, 10 ml EDTA anticoagulated blood samples will be divided immediately after centrifugation into 12 equal 1 ml aliquots in specified tubes and frozen at -70° C.

6.3 Assessments During Study

The following parameters will be measured and recorded daily from 4:00-10:00 am using the values closest to 8:00 am (except where indicated) on days 1-7.

- 1. If receiving positive pressure ventilation:
 - (a) Mode
 - (b) PEEP level
 - (c) Peak, plateau, and mean airway pressures
 - (d) Minute ventilation
- 2. FiO_2
- 3. PaO₂, PaCO₂, pH, and SpO₂
- 4. Mixed venous PO₂, PCO₂, pH, SO₂ (not mandated, but entered if recorded)
- 5. Central venous PO_2 and SO_2 (not mandated, but entered if recorded)
- 6. Hemodynamic values (twice daily)
 - (a) Systemic arterial systolic, diastolic, and mean pressure
 - (b) Heart rate (b/min)
 - (c) Central venous, pulmonary artery, PAOP, and end-diastolic pressures, and cardiac output
- 7. Intake in past 24 hours; intake to include types and volumes of various fluids (*e.g.* blood products, colloids, saline solutions).
- 8. Urine and other output in past 24 hours
- 9. Serum electrolytes, BUN, creatinine
- 10. Blood hemoglobin concentration
- 11. Administration of following:
 - (a) Vasopressors
 - (b) Inotropic agents
 - (c) Diuretics
- 12. Experimental treatment (e.g. nitric oxide)
- 13. Frontal chest radiograph
 - (a) Lung injury score

- (b) Presence or absence of barotrauma
- 14. Brussels score
 - (a) Worst PaO_2/FiO_2 for that date
 - (b) Worst systolic blood pressure for that date
 - (c) Worst creatinine, bilirubin, and platelet count for that date
 - (d) Use of vasopressors
 - (e) Glasgow Coma Score
- 15. Results of special diagnostic studies performed to assess hemodynamic status in past 24 hours (echocardiogram, etc.)
- 16. Signs of effectiveness of the arterial circulation (capillary refill time, knee mottling, skin temperature, etc.)
- 17. Evidence of anasarca (physical exam)
- 18. Blood for cytokines, mediators, and markers of lung injury. Plasma obtained from two, 10 ml EDTA anticoagulated blood samples will be divided immediately after centrifugation into 12 equal 1 ml aliquots in specified tubes and frozen at -70° C. Blood will be collected on Days 0, 1, 3, and 7.
- 19. Vital status at 90 days if still in hospital.

In addition, the following will be recorded if they occur when a PAC or CVC is in place and up to 3 days thereafter:

- 1. Catheter-related fungemia or bacteremia
- 2. Arrhythmias
- 3. Venous thromboembolism in the veins adjacent to insertion of the CVC or PAC

7 Statistical Considerations

This study uses a 2x2 factorial design comparing the use of a liberal fluid management strategy and a conservative fluid management strategy and

comparing the use of the PAC to the use of the CVC. The trial will accrue 250 patients in each of the four arms, which will give over 90% power to detect a difference of 10% (from 31% to 21%) in 60 day mortality at hospital discharge in the two primary comparisons using a two-sided p=.05 significance level.

This sample size consideration is based on the results of our earlier study (ARMA). This study found a 31.3% and 39.8% mortality at hospital discharge for 6 ml/kg and 12 ml/kg ventilation.

7.1 Early Stopping and Monitoring

DSMB meetings will be scheduled when 200, 400, 600, and 800 patients have been treated. A two sided O'Brien-Fleming boundary [32] will be used to determine whether to stop each factor separately. If one factor stops the other randomization may continue. The stopping boundaries correspond to two sided p-values of 0.0000048, 0.0012, 0.0083, 0.0222, and 0.0409.

At each DSMB meeting a test for interaction will be performed. This test will be controlled for multiple comparisons using a Pocock boundary [33] in order to maximize the chance of early detection of a failure of our assumption that the effects of the two factors are additive. If a significant interaction is found it will be up to the DSMB to determine the best course of action. This may include stopping the trial or dropping one or more of the arms. The Pocock boundary for a trial with five looks at the data would have a two sided p-value of 0.0158.

The trial will also be monitored by the steering committee for feasibility. Feasibility parameters will include: accrual, the ability to follow the fluid management protocol, separation of the groups based on fluid balance data and the frequency that a PAC is placed in the group that is randomized to CVP. If any of these parameters indicate that the trial is not feasible the trial will be modified or terminated.

The principal analysis will be by intent-to-treat, based upon randomization assignment. For example, patients who where randomized to receive a CVC, but who receive a PAC sometime during the defined treatment period, will be analyzed as having received the CVC (the treatment that they were randomized to). The rate and timing of "crossovers" will be monitored and will be a feasibility parameter at each interim analysis.

8 Risk Assessment

This study involves randomization of two separate (but potentially interacting) interventions: 1) PAC vs. CVC, and 2) fluid "conservative" strategy vs. fluid "liberal" management strategy. Each of the two randomizations carries with it potential risks (and potential offsetting benefits), and the possible interactions between the two trials may also have risk or benefit.

The trial of PAC vs. CVC essentially studies the incremental benefit or risk of adding the PAC catheter to the management of an ALI/ARDS patient who otherwise would be treated at least with CVC catheter (see exclusion criteria). Therefore, the risks of participating in this trial do not include those directly attributable to obtaining central venous access, such as pneumothorax, inadvertent arterial puncture, "baseline" infection rate of such catheters, etc. (The probably rare exception would be the patient who when randomized to receive the PAC would require a second central venous access for this purpose, due to a requirement for multiple ports for medication administration, etc.) Rather, the primary risk of participating in this trial relates to the incremental risk of having a PAC vs. having a CVC alone. This would include known "physical risks", such as cardiac arrhythmias, pulmonary artery rupture, pulmonary infarction, etc., as well as physical risks of the PAC that may not vet be known. Furthermore, it is possible that the use of the PAC may lead to erroneous and adverse management, due either to inaccurate acquisition of the primary data (e.q., pulmonary artery occlusion pressure, cardiac output). Conversely, the major risk of not utilizing the PAC is inadequate hemodynamic management that may occur due to the lack of potentially important information provided by the PAC, but not by the CVC (e.g., pulmonary artery occlusion pressure, cardiac output, etc.).

The second trial consists of randomization to either a fluid "liberal" or "conservative" management strategy. Each of these strategies is thought to have potential benefit (such as lung protection in the fluid conservative group, and augmentation of renal and other organ perfusion in the fluid liberal group), but may also have risks (such as inadequate organ perfusion

in the fluid conservative group and excessive pulmonary edema and delayed lung recovery in the fluid liberal group). The net balance of these potentially opposing risks and benefits is not known. Furthermore, the actual risks involved with the application of the specific fluid liberal and fluid conservative management strategies posses potential risks, in that these specific strategies have not been tested in patients previously. However, each of the strategies is felt to be clinically reasonable by the collective judgement of experts in the field. Conversely, there may be potential benefit to patients from the specific application of either one or both of these fluid management strategies (relative to "routine" care), in that each of these strategies has been carefully derived by a group of experts. During the early phase of the trial, and for as long as necessary, very close and specific attention will be paid to the safety and clinical "validity" of the specific fluid management strategies.

It is also recognized that there may be "interaction" between the two trials, which may cause benefit or risk, as well. For example, perhaps the fluid conservative management strategy is superior only when applied with the use of a PAC, but is hazardous when applied only with a CVC. In this hypothetical example, therefore, the patients randomized to receive the PAC with the fluid conservative strategy might have the best outcome among the four groups, whereas the patients randomized to CVC with the fluid conservative strategy might have the worst outcome of the four groups. The potential risks or benefits of such interactions between the two trials will be carefully monitored by the DSMB.

9 Data Collection and Site Monitoring

9.1 Data Collection

Each site will have one or more computers. The research coordinator will be responsible for maintaining a database using a custom designed database application. Data will be stored in this computer and transferred to the Clinical Coordinating Center on a prescribed basis.

9.2 Site Monitoring

Site visits will be performed on a regular basis by the Data Coordinating Center, to ensure that all regulatory requirements are being met and to monitor the quality of the data collected. Records of IRB approvals and patient charts will be examined on a spot check basis to evaluate the accuracy of the data entered into the database.

10 Human Subjects

All protocols will require that all study participants or a member of a patient's family sign an informed consent. All protocols will require prior IRB approval before any subject is entered into the study. All study participants or their families will be informed about the objectives of the study and the potential risks. All laboratory specimens, evaluation forms, and reports will be identified by a coded number only to maintain patient confidentiality. All records will be kept in a locked/password protected computer. All computer entry and networking programs will be done with coded numbers only. Clinical information will not be released without the written permission of the patient, except as necessary for monitoring by the FDA, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, and the ARDS Clinical Coordinating Center.

11 Adverse Event Reporting

The investigator will determine daily whether any clinical adverse experiences have occurred through study day 21 or ICU discharge, whichever occurs first. The investigator will evaluate any changes in laboratory values and physical signs and make a determine as to whether the change is clinically important and different from what is expected in the course of treatment of patients with ALI or ARDS. If clinically important and unexpected adverse experiences have occurred they will be recorded on the adverse event case report form.

The investigator will report all **serious**, AND **unexpected**, AND **study-related** adverse events, as defined in Appendix D, to the

Clinical Coordinating Center within 24 hours. The local Institutional Review Board must also be informed in a timely manner. The investigator will then submit a detailed written report to the Clinical Coordinating Center and the Institutional Review Board no later than 5 days after the investigator discovers the event.

The Clinical Coordinating Center will report all serious, unexpected, and study-related adverse events to the DSMB, by fax or telephone, within 7 calendar days. A written report will be sent to the DSMB within 15 calendar days and these reports will be sent to investigators for submission to their respective Institutional Review Boards. The DSMB will also review all adverse events during scheduled interim analyses. The Clinical Coordinating Center will distribute the written summary of the DSMB's periodic review of adverse events to investigators for submission to their respective Institutional Review Boards in accordance with NIH Guidelines.

12 Schedule of Events

References

- Swan HJC, Ganz W, Forrester JS, et al. Catheterization of the heart in man with use of a flow-directed balloon tipped catheter. N Engl J Med 1970; 283:447-451.
- [2] Spodnick DH. Physiologic and prognostic implications of invasive monitoring. Am J Cardiol 1980; 46:173-175.
- [3] Gore JM, Goldberg, RJ, Spodnick DH, et al. A community-wide assessment of the use of pulmonary artery catheters in patients with acute myocardial infarction. Chest 1987; 92:721-727.
- [4] Zion MM, Balkin J, Rosenmann D, et al. SPRINT Study Group: Use of pulmonary artery catheters in patients with acute myocardial infarction. Analysis of experience in 5,841 patients in the SPRING registry. Chest 1990; 98:1331-1335.
- [5] Greenland P, Reicher-Reiss H, Goldbourt U, Behar S, Israel Sprint Investigators. In-hospital and 1-year mortality in 1,542 women after myocardial infarction: comparison with 4,315 men. Circulation 1991; 83:484-491.
- [6] Blumberg MS, Binns GS. Swan-Gantz catheter use and mortality in the assessment of medical technology. Int J Epidemiol 1980; 9:361-367.
- [7] Hayes MA, Timmins AC, Yau EHS, Pallazo M, Hinds CJ, Watson D. Elevation of systemic oxygen delivery in the treatment of critically ill patients. N Engl J Med 1994; 330:1717-1722.
- [8] Bush HS, Taylor RW, Thoi L, et al. Does hemodynamic monitoring improve survival in a medical intensive care unit? Crit Care Med 1989; 17:S13.
- [9] Connors AF Jr., Speroff T, Dawson NV, et al. The effectiveness of right heart catheterization in the initial care of critically ill patients. JAMA 1996; 276:889-897.
- [10] Connors AF Jr., McCaffree DR, Gray BA, et al. Evaluation of right heart catheterization in the critically ill patient without acute myocardial infarction. N Engl J Med 1983; 308:263-267.

- [11] Eisenberg PR, Jaffe AS, Schuster DP. Clinical evaluation compared to pulmonary artery catheterization in the hemodynamic assessment of critically ill patients. Crit Care Med 1984; 12: 549-553.
- [12] Wiedemann HP, Matthay MA, Matthay RA. Today's practice of cardiopulmonary medicine: cardiovascular-pulmonary monitoring in the intensive care unit (Part 1). Chest 1984; 85:537-549.
- [13] Iberti TJ, Fischer EP, Leibowitz AB, et al. A multicenter study of physicians knowledge of the pulmonary artery catheter. JAMA 1990; 264:2928-2932.SIS-4. A randomized factorial trial assessing early oral captopril, oral monomitrate, and intravenous magnesium sulfate in 58, 050 patients with suspected acute myocardial infarction. Lancet 1995; 345:669-685.
- [14] Tobin MJ. Principles and practice of intensive care monitoring. McGraw Hill, 1998.
- [15] Boyd O. To the Editor. JAMA 1997; 277:110.
- [16] Task Force on Guidelines for Pulmonary Artery Catheterization. Practice guidelines for pulmonary artery catheterization. Anesthesiology 1993; 78:380-384.
- [17] Shah KB, Rao TLK, Laughlin S, El-Etr AA. A review of pulmonary artery catheterization in 6,245 patients. Anesthesiology 1984; 61:271-275.
- [18] Connors AF Jr., Castele FJ, Farhat NZ, Tomashefski JF Jr. Complications of right heart catheterization. A prospective autopsy study. Chest 1985; 88:567-572.
- [19] Mermel LA, McCormick RD, Springman SR, Maki DG. The pathogenesis and epidemiology of catheter-related infection with pulmonary artery Swan-Ganz catheters: a prospective study utilizing molecular subtyping. Am J Med 1991; 91(Suppl 3B):197S-205S.
- [20] Pulmonary Artery Catheter Consensus Conference Participants. Pulmonary artery catheter consensus conference: consensus statement. Crit Care Med 1997; 25:910-925.
- [21] Beale RJ, Wyncoll D, McLuckie A. To the Editor. JAMA 1997; 277:110.

- [22] Naylor CD, Sibbald WJ, Sprung CL, et al. Pulmonary artery catheterization. Can there be an integrated strategy for guideline development and research promotion? JAMA 1993; 269:2407-2411.
- [23] Tuman KJ, McCarthy RJ, Spiess BD, et al. Effect of pulmonary artery catheterization on outcome in patients undergoing coronary artery surgery. Anesthesiology 1989; 70:199-206.
- [24] Matthay MA, Broaddus VC. Fluid and hemodynamic management in acute lung injury. Seminars in Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine 1994, 15:271-288.
- [25] Mitchell JP, Schuller D, Calandrino FS, Schuster DP. Improved outcome based on fluid management in critically ill patients requiring pulmonary artery catheterization. Am Rev Respir Dis 1992; 145:990-998.
- [26] Humphrey H, Hall J, Sznajder I, Silverstein M, Wood L. Improved survival in ARDS patients associated with a reduction in pulmonary capillary wedge pressure. Chest 1990; 97:1176-1180.
- [27] Matthay MA, Chatterjee K. Bedside catheterization of the pulmonary artery: risks compared with benefits. Annals of Internal Medicine 1988, 109:826-834.
- [28] Dalen JE, Bone RC. Is it time to pull the pulmonary artery catheter? JAMA 1996; 276:916-918.
- [29] West JB, Mathieu-Costello O: Stress failure of pulmonary capillaries. In Crystal RG, West JB, et al. (eds): The Lung: Philadelphia, Lippincott-Raven, 1997, 1493-1501.
- [30] Tuman KJ, Rozien MF. Outcome assessment and pulmonary artery catheterization: why does the debate continue? Anesth Analg 1997; 84:1-4.
- [31] Hughes MD. Stopping guidelines for clinical trials with multiple treatments. Statistics in Medicine 1993; 12(10):901-915.
- [32] O'Brien PC, Fleming TR. A multiple testing procedure for clinical trials. Biometrics 1979; 35:549-556.
- [33] Pocock SJ. Group sequential methods in the design and analysis of clinical trials. Biometrika 1997; 64:191-200.

[34] Pugh RN, Murray-Lyon IM, Dawson JL, Pietroni MC, Williams R. Transection of the oesophagus for bleeding oesophageal varices. Br J Surg 60: 646-649, 1973.

13 Appendices

A Composite Fluid Protocol Table

(Insert the Composite Protocol Table Here)

B Footnotes, Version IV

A. Dobutamine:

- Start at 5 mcg/kg/min and increase by 5 mcg/kg/min increments at 15 minute intervals until ineffective circulation reversed (CI ≥ 2.5 for PAC or fewer than 3 physical findings of ineffective circulation for CVP) or maximum dose of 20 mcg/kg/min reached.
- 2. Begin weaning 4 hours after ineffective circulation is reversed. Wean by $\geq 25\%$ of the stabilizing dose at intervals of ≤ 4 hours to maintain effective circulation
- B. Furosemide (no diuretic substitution allowed):
 - 1. Withhold if:

vasopressor or a fluid bolus given last 12 hours **OR** renal failure present (dialysis dependence) **OR** oliguria with creatinine >3, **OR** oliguria with creatinine 0-3 and urinary studies indicative of acute renal failure.

2. For cells 3, 7, and 8:

Begin continuous infusion of 3 mg/hour **OR** 20 mg bolus **OR** last known effective dose. Reassess urine output in 1 hour. Double dose *hourly* until urine output ≥ 0.5 ml/kg/hour **OR** maximum infusion of 24 mg/hour or maximum bolus of 160 mg is reached. Discontinue furosemide if no response to maximum dose after 1 hour.

3. For cells 11, 15, 16, 18:

Begin continuous infusion of 3 mg/hour **OR** 20 mg bolus **OR** last known effective dose. Reassess in 4 hours; if still in a cell for which furosemide is indicated then:

- If intravascular pressure has declined by one or more pressure ranges (rows) repeat the same dose as before, and then reassess in 4 hours.
- If intravascular pressure range has not declined by one or more pressure ranges (rows), and if average urine output over the preceding four hours is less than or equal to 3ml/kg, double the preceding dose and reassess in 4 hours. If average urine output over the preceding four hours is

greater than 3ml/kg, then give the same dose as before and reassess within four hours. Maximum daily infusion dose = $24 mg/hour \ge 12 hours$ (3 four hour cycles); maximum bolus does = 160 mg q 4 hours ≥ 3 doses.

- 4. Repeat diuretic trial q 24 hours unless criteria in footnote B1 met. This period begins with administration of first protocol mandated dose of furosemide.
- C. Fluid Bolus (Non-shock, except cell #19):
 - 1. Administer 15 ml/kg PBW normal saline, Plasmalyte, or Ringer's lactate (rounded to nearest 250 cc) or 1 unit of RBCs or 25 grams albumin (choice at discretion of physician) over ≤ 1 hour then reassess patient. For cells 5,6,9,10, reassess within one hour. For cells 13,14,19, reassess within four hours. Administer up to 3 boluses over 24 hours if indicated by protocol. This 24 hour period begins with the first protocol-mandated non-shock bolus **OR** the first protocol-mandated bolus following shock reversal.
 - 2. Additional fluid boluses are allowed at the discretion of the physician.
- D. Fluid Bolus (Cell #19 only):
 - 1. Withhold fluid bolus if: Cardiac index (CI) ≥ 4.5 **OR** FiO₂ ≥ 0.7 .
 - 2. Use 15 ml/kg PBW normal saline, Plasmalyte, or Ringer's lactate (rounded to nearest 250 cc) or 1 unit of RBCs or 25 grams albumin (physicians discretion) over ≤ 1 hour then reassess patient. Administer up to 3 boluses over 24 hours if indicated by protocol. This 24 hour period begins with the first protocol-mandated non-shock bolus **OR** the first protocol-mandated bolus following shock reversal.
 - 3. Additional fluid boluses are allowed at the discretion of the physician.

E. KVO IV:

1. Also minimize as much as possible all other fluid volume (e.g., for delivery of antibiotics etc.), except as required for nutrition support.

- F. Guidelines for Management of Shock: Shock is defined as a MAP < 60 mmHg or a MAP > 60 while receiving vasopressors. Physicians have the choice of either fluid bolus and/or vasopressor therapy (in any order) as follows:
 - 1. Fluid Bolus (Shock):

Use 15 ml/kg PBW normal saline, Plasmalyte, or Ringers (rounded to nearest 250 cc) or 1 unit of RBCs or 25 grams albumin (physicians discretion) over ≤ 1 hour then reassess patient.

2. Vasopressor Therapy:

Choice of any single agent or any combination of the following:

- Dopamine 5 mcg/kg/min, increase to a maximum of 25 mcg/kg/min.
- Norepinephrine at 1 mcg/min, increase to a maximum of 100 mcg/min.
- Epinephrine at 1 mcg/min, increase to a maximum of 20 mcg/min.
- Phenylephrine at 10 mcg/min, increase to a maximum of 500 mcg/min.
- 3. Vasopressor Weaning (includes any dose of dopamine):
 - When MAP > 60 mmHg on a stable dose of vasopressor, begin reduction of the vasopressor by ≥ 25% of the stabilizing dose at intervals of ≤ 4 hours to maintain MAP ≥ 60 mmHg.
- G. Invalid PAOP
 - 1. If a valid PAOP measurement cannot be obtained, use the pulmonary artery diastolic pressure to estimate the PAOP, based upon the most recently available relationship between PAOP and PADP, and assuming a stable arithmetic difference between the two values. For example, if the most recent prior valid measurements showed a PAOP = 10 and a PADP = 15, and the current PADP = 20 and a valid PAOP cannot be obtained, then assume a current PAOP = 15.
 - 2. If neither a valid PAOP or PADP can be obtained, then utilize the current CVP value.

C Ventilator Procedures

C.1 Volume Cycled Ventilation

C.1.1 Ventilator mode:

Volume Cycled Assist Control

C.1.2 Tidal Volume and Ventilator Rate Adjustments and Arterial pH Management.

1. Initial Ventilator Tidal Volume and Rate.

Tidal Volume

(In the following procedures, the term "tidal volume" refers to inspired volumes, corrected for gas compression in the ventilator conduits.)

Initial tidal volumes will be set at 8 ml/kg predicted body weight (PBW) if pre-randomization tidal volume is > 8.1 ml/kg PBW. If pre-randomization tidal volume is 7.1 - 8.0 ml/kg PBW, then initial tidal volume will be 7 ml/kg PBW. If pre-randomization tidal volume is 6.1 - 7.0, initial tidal volume will be 6 ml/kg PBW. If pre-randomization tidal volume is ≤ 6.0 ml/kg PBW, initial tidal volume will be 6 ml/kg PBW. This will be reduced by 1 ml/kg PBW at intervals of ≤ 2 hours until tidal volume = 6 ml/kg PBW.

Predicted body weight (PBW) is calculated from age, gender, and height (heel to crown) according to the following equations:

Males: PBW (kg) = 50 + 2.3 [height (inches) - 60] Females: PBW (kg) = 45.5 + 2.3 [height (inches) - 60]

Ventilator Rate

Initial ventilator rate will be set to match minute ventilation prior to enrollment, if possible. Maximum rate = 35/min.

2. Adjustments to Ventilator Tidal Volume and Rate.

Goals: Ventilator rate and tidal volume will be adjusted to achieve specific goals of arterial pH and end-inspiratory alveolar (plateau) pressure, respectively.

Arterial pH Goals

- Arterial pH Goal: $7.30 \le \text{pH} \le 7.45$.
- Arterial pH will be measured when clinically indicated.
- Management of alkalemia and acidemia may be according to the following rules:
 - (a) Alkalemia (pH > 7.45): Decrease ventilator rate, if possible.
 - (b) Mild acidemia $(7.15 \le pH < 7.30)$:
 - Increase ventilator rate up to maximum of 35 or until pH > 7.30 or PaCO_2 < 25 mm Hg.
 - If ventilator rate = 35 or PaCO₂ < 25, then bicarbonate infusion may be given.
 - (c) Severe acidemia (pH < 7.15):
 - Increase ventilator rate to 35.
 - If ventilator rate = 35 and pH < 7.15 and bicarbonate has been considered or infused, then tidal volume may be increased by 1 ml/kg until pH \geq 7.15 (under these conditions, the plateau pressure targets described below may be exceeded).

Plateau Pressure Goals: \leq 30 cmH₂O.

- Plateau pressures will be measured at a minimum frequency of q4 hours. Plateau pressures will also be measured and recorded 1-5 minutes after each change in PEEP or tidal volume. For each measurement, patients will be relaxed, not coughing or moving. The pressure corresponding to the first plateau that occurs after initiating a 0.5 second pause will be recorded. The pause will be removed for at least 6 breaths. The plateau pressure measurements will be replicated 3 times with at least 6 "non-plateau" breaths between measurements and the mean of the three values will be calculated. If plateau pressure cannot be measured because of air leaks, then peak inspiratory pressure will be substituted.
- Tidal volumes will be reduced (if arterial pH > 7.15, see section 2c, above) by 1 ml/kg q2-3 hours if necessary to maintain plateau pressures ≤ the respective target value.
- The minimum tidal volume will be 4 ml/kg PBW.

- Changes in the tidal volume, if indicated above, will be made within five minutes. Tidal volumes will be increased if plateau pressure << target.
 - (a) If tidal volume < 6 ml/kg and plateau pressure $\leq 25 \text{ cmH}_2\text{O}$, then tidal volume will be increased by 1 ml/kg until plateau pressure $\geq 25 \text{ cmH}_2\text{O}$ or tidal volume = 6 ml/kg PBW.
 - (b) If tidal volume < 8 ml/kg PBW AND Pplat $< 30 \text{ cmH}_2\text{O}$ AND airway pressure remains below the PEEP level during inspiration or the ventilator delivers frequent ($\geq 3/\text{minute}$) double breaths because airway pressure falls below trigger threshold at the end of inspiration, then tidal volume will be increased by 1 ml/kg PBW. If these phenomena persist at tidal volume 8 ml/kg PBW or with Pplat $\geq 30 \text{ cm H}_2\text{O}$, additional sedation or neuromuscular blockade should be considered.

C.1.3 Inspiratory flow and I:E ratio.

Inspiratory flow rate will be adjusted to achieve I:E = 1:1.0 - 1:1.3.

C.1.4 Oxygenation.

In both treatment groups, target ranges for oxygenation will be:

 $55 \text{ mmHg} \le \text{PaO}_2 \le 80 \text{ mmHg}$

or
$$88\% \leq SpO_2$$
-sat $\leq 95\%$

When both PaO_2 and SpO_2 are available simultaneously, the PaO_2 criterion will take precedence.

Oxygenation will be maintained in the target ranges using the following $PEEP/FiO_2$ combinations:

FiO_2	.30	.40	.40	.50	.50	.60	.70	.70	.70	.80	.90	.90	.90	1.0	1.0
PEEP	5	5	8	8	10	10	10	12	14	14	14	16	18	18	18-24

(Levels of PEEP in this $FiO_2/PEEP$ scale represent levels set on the ventilator, not levels of total PEEP, auto-PEEP, or intrinsic PEEP.)

- Arterial oxygenation will be assessed by either SpO_2 or PaO_2 at a minimum frequency of q4 hours. When SpO_2 is used to assess arterial oxygenation, the following measures will be taken if possible to improve accuracy: the SpO_2 sensor will be checked to ensure optimal position, cleanliness, and consistent readings with satisfactory waveforms; no position changes or endobronchial suctioning for ≥ 10 minutes; no invasive procedures or ventilator changes for ≥ 30 minutes. SpO_2 will be observed for a minimum of 1 minute, and a representative value will be recorded on the appropriate source-document flowsheet.
- If arterial oxygenation is not within the target range, then either FiO_2 or PEEP will be adjusted within 30 minutes. Following these adjustments, oxygenation will be reassessed within 15 minutes and subsequent adjustments made if necessary.
- If a patient's PEEP/FiO₂ is not compatible with the PEEP/FiO₂ scale (e.g. immediately after randomization or after urgent changes in FiO₂ or PEEP in response to desaturations, hypotension, etc.), either PEEP or FiO₂ (or both) will be adjusted at intervals of 5-15 minutes until the PEEP/FiO₂ is compatible with the scale. The procedures for adjusting PEEP and FiO₂ to make them compatible with the scale are as follows:
 - Arterial oxygenation higher than the target range:

 FiO_2 or PEEP will be decreased (by .10 or 2.0 respectively), whichever is farther (number of step changes) from the target scale shown in the accompanying table. If both PEEP and FiO_2 are equally distanced from the scale, then PEEP will be decreased.

• Arterial oxygenation lower than the target range:

FiO₂ or PEEP will be increased (by .10 or 2.0, respectively), whichever is farther from the target scale shown in the table. If both PEEP and FiO₂ are equidistant from the scale, then PEEP will be increased first.

• Arterial oxygenation within the target range:
- If single adjustment in either FiO_2 or PEEP would correct the $FiO_2/PEEP$ to the target scale, then FiO_2 will be adjusted. If the $FiO_2/PEEP$ cannot be corrected to the target scale with a single adjustment, then FiO_2 will be adjusted by .10 and PEEP will simultaneously adjusted in the opposite direction by 2.0. E.g., increase FiO_2 by .10 and decrease PEEP by 2.0, or decrease FiO_2 by .10 and increase PEEP by 2.0.
- If $PaO_2 < 55 \text{ mmHg or } SpO_2 < 88\%$ and tidal volume = 4 ml/kg PBW (or the minimum tidal volume necessary for pH control, section C.1.4) and plateau pressure ≥ 30 , then FiO₂ will be raised until $PaO_2 \geq 55$ or $SpO_2 \geq 88\%$ or FiO₂ = 1.0. If $PaO_2 < 55$ mm Hg or $SpO_2 < 88\%$ and FiO₂ = 1.0, PEEP will be raised by 2 cm H₂O increments to 24 cm H₂O. (In these circumstances, plateau pressure may exceed 30 cm H₂O).
- Brief periods (≤ 5 minutes) of SpO₂ < 88% or > 95% may be tolerated without making changes in PEEP or FiO₂.
- $FiO_2 = 1.0$ may be used for brief intervals (10 minutes) of transient desaturation or to prevent desaturation during treatments such as tracheo-bronchial suctioning or position changes.
 - If FiO₂ = 1.0 and PEEP = 25 cmH₂O and I:E =1.0 and PaO₂ < 55 or SpO₂ < 88%, then a PEEP increase trial may be performed as follows:
 - 1. Increase PEEP by 2-5 cmH₂O increments to a maximum of $34 \text{ cmH}_2\text{O}$ or until PaO₂ ≥ 55 or SpO₂ $\geq 88\%$.
 - 2. If the PEEP increase trial is not effective within 4 hours (PaO₂ increased by at least 5 mmHg), then PEEP will be returned to 24 cmH₂O.

C.1.5 Simultaneous changes

Changes in more than one ventilator setting driven by measurements of PO_2 , pH, and plateau pressure may be performed simultaneously, if necessary. Arterial blood gases will be obtained after all ventilator changes as clinically indicated.

C.2 Weaning

C.2.1 Commencement of Weaning

Patients will be assessed for the following criteria each day between 0600 and 1000. If a patient procedure, test, or other extenuating circumstance prevents assessment for these criteria between 0600 and 1000, then the assessment and initiation of subsequent weaning procedures may be delayed for up to four hours.

- 1. \geq 12 hours since initial protocol ventilator changes, if any.
- 2. FiO₂ \leq .40.
- 3. Values of both PEEP and $FiO_2 \leq$ values from previous day (comparing Reference Measurement values, section 6.3).
- 4. Not receiving neuromuscular blocking agents and without neuromuscular blockade.
- 5. Patient exhibiting inspiratory efforts. Ventilator rate will be decreased to 50% of baseline level for up to 5 minutes to detect inspiratory efforts if no efforts are evident at baseline ventilator rate.
- 6. Systolic arterial pressure ≥ 90 mmHg without vasopressor support ($\leq 5 \ \mu g/kg/min$ dopamine or dobutamine or equivalent low dose of another vasopressor will not be considered a vasopressor).

If criteria 1-6 are met, weaning potential will be assessed during a CPAP trial of ≤ 5 minutes at CPAP = 5 cm H₂O and FiO₂ =.50. If respiratory rate remains $\leq 35/\text{min}$ during the 5-minute CPAP trial, the patient will have met the commencement of weaning criteria and will enter the Pressure Support Wean Procedure (Section). If respiratory rate exceeds 35/min during the 5-minute CPAP trial, the patient will resume A/C ventilation at the most recent settings. The patient will be reassessed for weaning the following day at 0600-1000. (If failure to maintain the respiratory rate ≤ 35 during the CPAP trial is attributed primarily to anxiety, then appropriate treatment for anxiety will be given and a second 5-minute CPAP trial initiated within 4 hours).

C.2.2 Initial Pressure Support (PS) Setting

(for patients with respiratory rate $\leq 35/\text{min}$ during 5-minute CPAP trial).

- 1. Mode = Pressure Support. Only the following PS levels may be used: 5, 10, 15, and 20 cm H_2O .
- 2. If respiratory rate $\leq 25/\text{min}$ during the 5-minute CPAP trial and tolerance criteria (section C.2.3, below) are met, then initiate PS = 5cm H₂O. If the respiratory rate = 26-35 during the 5-minute CPAP trial, then set initial PS = 20 cmH₂O and make adjustments to PS within 5 minutes if necessary to achieve respiratory rate = 26-35.
- 3. PEEP = 5 cmH₂O.
- 4. $FiO_2 = .50$.

C.2.3 Assessment for Tolerance

Patients will be assessed for tolerance using the following criteria:

- 1. Total respiratory rate < 35 (5 min at respiratory rate > 35 may be tolerated).
- 2. $\text{SpO}_2 \ge 88\%$ (< 15 min at < 88% may be tolerated).
- 3. No respiratory distress (two or more of the following):
 - (a) Heart rate greater than 120% of the 0600 rate ($\leq 5 \text{ min at} > 120\%$ may be tolerated).
 - (b) Marked use of accessory muscles.
 - (c) Abdominal paradox.
 - (d) Diaphoresis.
 - (e) Marked subjective dyspnea.

If any of goals 1, 2, or 3 are not met on initial set-up to PS, the ventilator mode will be changed back to A/C at back-up rate = most recent A/C settings and the patient will be reassessed the next morning.

C.2.4 Subsequent ventilator settings

- 1. Reduce PS level by 5 cm H_2O q1-3 hours. PS will not be decreased below 5 cm H_2O . No decreases in PS will be made after 1900.
- 2. If PS = 10, 15 or 20 cmH₂O is not tolerated, then return to A/C.
 - (a) At 0600-1000 of the next day, return to last PS level tolerated and continue with step 1.
- 3. If PS level = $5 \text{ cmH}_2\text{O}$ is not tolerated, increase PS by $5 \text{ cmH}_2\text{O}$ to $10 \text{ cmH}_2\text{O}$ and maintain until the following morning.
 - (a) If a patient on PS=5 or 10 must go back to A/C for reasons other than intolerance to weaning (e.g., surgical or other invasive procedures), the weaning sequence will be re-entered with section C.2.1.
- 4. If $PS = 5 \text{ cm H}_2O$ is tolerated for two or more hours (using tolerance criteria 1-3 above), assess for ability to sustain unassisted breathing (section C.2.5).

C.2.5 Assess for ability to sustain unassisted breathing.

Initiate a trial of spontaneous breathing on CPAP ≤ 5 cm H₂O, T-piece, or tracheostomy mask with FiO₂ $\leq .50$. Monitor for the following:

- 1. $\text{SpO}_2 \ge 90\%$ and/or $\text{PaO}_2 \ge 60$ mmHg.
- 2. Spontaneous tidal volume $\geq 4 \text{ ml/kg}$ predicted body weight.
- 3. Respiratory Rate $\leq 35/\text{min.}$
- 4. pH \geq 7.30 if measured.
- 5. No respiratory distress (2 or more of the following):
 - (a) Heart rate > 120% of the 0600 rate (5 min at > 120% may be tolerated).
 - (b) Marked use of accessory muscles.
 - (c) Abdominal paradox.

- (d) Diaphoresis.
- (e) Marked subjective dyspnea.

If criteria 1-5 are met for > 120 minutes, continue with unassisted breathing. If any criteria 1-5 are not met during the 120 minute trial, then resume PS ventilation at 5 cmH₂O and assess for tolerance (section C.2.3).

C.3 Definition of unassisted breathing.

- (a) Extubated with face mask, nasal prong oxygen, or room air, OR
- (b) T-tube breathing, OR
- (c) Tracheostomy mask breathing, OR
- (d) CPAP ≤ 5 without PS or IMV assistance.

C.4 Completion of ventilator procedures.

Patients will be considered to have completed the study ventilator procedures if any of the following conditions occur:

- (a) Death.
- (b) Hospital discharge.
- (c) Alive 28 days after enrollment.

If a patient requires positive pressure ventilation after a period of unassisted breathing, the study ventilator procedures will resume unless the patient was discharged from the study hospital or > 28 days elapsed since enrollment.

C.5 Premature Withdrawal from Treatment.

Patients may be removed from the 6 ml/kg tidal volume ventilation protocol if they develop neurologic conditions where hypercapnia would be contraindicated (*e.g.*, intracranial bleeding, $GCS \leq 8$, cerebral edema, mass effect [midline shift on CT scan], papilledema, intracranial pressure monitoring, fixed pupils).

D Adverse Events

1. Procedures for Reporting Adverse Events

- Assuring patient safety is an essential component of this protocol. Each participating investigator has primary responsibility for the safety of the individual participants under his or her care. All adverse events will be evaluated by the Principal Investigator. The Study Coordinator must view patient records for possible adverse events throughout the study period. All adverse events occurring within the study period must be reported in the participants' case report forms.
- The investigator will report all serious, unexpected, and study-related adverse events to the Clinical Coordinating Center within 24 hours. The Institutional Review Board must also be informed in a timely manner. The investigator will then submit a detailed written report to the Clinical Coordinating Center and the Institutional Review Board no later than 5 days after the investigator discovers the event.
- 2. Definitions of Adverse Events

A serious adverse event is any event that is fatal or immediately life threatening, is permanently disabling, or severely incapacitating, or requires or prolongs inpatient hospitalization. Important medical events that may not result in death, be life threatening, or require hospitalization may be considered a serious adverse experience when, based upon appropriate medical judgement, they may jeopardize the patient or subject and may require medical or surgical intervention to prevent one of the outcomes listed above.

Life-threatening means that the patient was, in the view of the investigator, at immediate risk of death from the reaction as it occurred. It does not include the reaction that, had it occurred in a more serious form, might have caused death. Assessment of the cause of the event has no bearing on the assessment of the event's severity.

An *unexpected* event is any experience not identified by type, severity, or frequency in the current study protocol or an event that occurred unexpectedly in the course of treatment for Acute Lung Injury or ARDS. Adverse events will be considered to be study-related the event follows a reasonable temporal sequence from a study procedure and could readily have been produced by the study procedure.

Organ failures related to ARDS or a patient's underlying condition should not be reported as adverse events since they are systemically captured by the protocol data collection.

E Genetic Testing Procedures

Portions of the blood samples and buccal smears collected, processed, and stored as specified in this protocol may be used for genetic analyses in the future. Genetic analysis will involve, in part, the analysis of genomic DNA and will attempt to link genotypic information to the extensive phenotypic information measured as part of this study. A layered informed consent will be used to obtain the study subjects' consent for genetic testing as follows: 1) consent for genetic studies related to ARDS, or; 2) consent for future studies not necessarily related to ARDS, or 3) consent for genetic testing in both of these categories. The level of an individual's consent for testing (e.g. none, for ARDS studies, for future studies, or all studies) will be recorded in the Case Report Forms and stored in the Clinical Coordinating Center Database.

Samples will be sent to a laboratory for DNA extraction and then sent to a central repository to be stored (as described below). No DNA will be stored or retained at the extraction laboratory. Samples will be identified by their ARDSNet Study Numbers during shipment, extraction, and storage. When approved studies for genetic testing are received at the CCC, the CCC will identify samples that have the necessary level of informed consent for genetic testing. The CCC will then instruct the repository to prepare the appropriate samples for shipment. These samples will have their ARDSNet Study Numbers removed and will be re-labeled (anonymized) with a new number prior to shipment. The key relating the ARDSNet study number to the new specimen number will be kept at the CCC in a locked file. The CCC does not record nor store unique patient identifiers (such as initials, date of birth, hospital record numbers, addresses, phone numbers, etc.) in the data base.

Upon completion of Network activities, the CCC will assign new Study Numbers for all ARDSNet Study subjects. The CCC will then instruct the repository to strip all samples of their ARDSNet identifiers and re-label them with the new study subject numbers. This will prevent investigators from using the ARDS Net Study Numbers to identify individual subjects in the future.

Should patients or surrogates revoke their consent for genetic testing, the clinical sites will notify the CCC. The CCC will then contact the repository and request that all samples collected for genetic analysis for that patient

(identified by the ARDSNet study number) be destroyed. Confirmation of destruction of samples will be sent to the CCC and forwarded to the clinical site only until the end of the network; after that, there will be no way to retrieve the samples since they will have been anonymized.

E.1 Sample Collection for genetic testing

- 1. Two 7.5 ml EDTA plastic monovette tubes will be used to collect up to 10 ml of blood on each patient with consent for genetic testing. Samples will be labeled with pre-printed label with the subjects ARDSNet study number.
- 2. Three buccal swabs will be collected in patients who have received blood products within the past 5 days or in whom the transfusion history is unknown. The purpose of obtaining buccal swabs (in addition to whole blood) in patients who have received blood products is to verify that the DNA isolated from whole blood is indeed tha patients DNA (*i.e.*, same as in buccal epithelial cells) and not that of the blood products donor. The brush will be twirled against the inner cheek for 30 seconds and each tube will be be labeled with a pre-printed ARDSNet label.
- 3. Shipments will be made at approximately monthly intervals to the DNA extraction laboratory.

F Exclusion Definitions

For exclusion criterion #17 (Chronic Liver Disease), calculate the Child-Pugh Score. Patients with a history of chronic liver disease and Child-Pugh Class C, which is defined as a total of 10-15 points on the following scoring table [34], are to be excluded from the trial. The Child-Pugh Score does not need to be calculated for patients with a history of acute liver disease.

17. Liver Failure: Child-Pugh Class C, which is defined as a total of 10-15 points on the following scoring table.

Points	Class
5-6	А
7-9	В
≥ 10	\mathbf{C}

	Numerical score for increasing abnormality				
Measurement	1	2	3		
Ascites	None	Present	Tense		
Encephalopathy	None	Grade I or II	Grade III or IV		
Bilirubin (mg/dl)	< 2	2-3	> 3		
Albumin (g/L)	>35	28-35	<28		
Prothrombin time (sec. prolonged)	1-4	4-10	> 10		

B. Footnotes, Version VI (Clarified)

A. Dobutamine:

- Start at 5 mcg/kg/min and increase by 5 mcg/kg/min increments at 15 minute intervals until ineffective circulation reversed (CI greater than or equal to 2.5 for PAC or fewer than 3 physical findings of ineffective circulation for CVP) or maximum dose of 20 mcg/kg/min reached.
- 2. Begin weaning 4 hours after ineffective circulation is reversed. Wean by greater than or equal to 25% of the stabilizing dose at intervals of less than or equal to 4 hours to maintain effective circulation
- 3. If a patient is on dobutamine as a result of an earlier cell assignment, dobutamine should be ignored for the purpose of subsequent cell assignment, but should continue to be weaned per protocol.

B. Furosemide

If the protocol instructs the use of furosemide, and furosemide is unavailable, then bumetanide should be substituted for furosemide, with a dose equivalency ratio of 40:1 (40mg of furosemide = 1 mg of bumetanide). As the protocol allows with furosemide, bumetanide can be delivered either via bolus or continuous infusion at the discretion of the physicians caring for the patient. If and when furosemide becomes available again, furosemide should be utilized to carry out protocol instructions.

- 1. Withhold if:
 - a. vasopressor or a fluid bolus given last 12 hours **OR**
 - b. renal failure present (dialysis dependence)* OR
 - c. oliguria with creatinine >3, **OR**
 - d. oliguria with creatinine 0-3 and urinary studies indicative of acute renal failure.

2. For cells 3, 7, and 8:

Begin continuous infusion of 3 mg/hour **OR** 20 mg bolus **OR** last known protocol specified effective dose. Reassess in 1 hour. Double dose hourly until urine output is greater than or equal to 0.5 ml/kg/hour **OR** maximum infusion of 24 mg/hour or maximum bolus of 160 mg is reached. Discontinue furosemide if no response to maximum dose after 1 hour.

3. For cells 11, 15, 16, 18:

Begin continuous infusion of 3 mg/hour **OR** 20 mg bolus **OR** last known protocol specified effective dose. Reassess in 4 hours; if still in a cell for which furosemide is indicated then:

- a. If intravascular pressure has declined by one or more pressure ranges (rows) repeat the same dose as before, and then reassess in 4 hours.
- b. If intravascular pressure range has not declined by one or more pressure ranges (rows), and if average urine output over the preceding four hours is less than or equal to 3ml/kg/hr, double the preceding dose and reassess in 4 hours. If average urine output over the preceding four hours is greater than 3ml/kg/hr, then give the same dose as before and reassess within four hours. Maximum daily infusion dose = 24 mg/hour x 12 hours (3 four hour cycles); maximum bolus dose = 160 mg q 4 hours x 3 doses.
- 4. If either the maximum daily infusion (24mg/hr x 12 hrs) or maximum bolus dose sequence (160 mg x 3) is given, then do not give additional furosemide doses for 12 hours following the end of the 12 hour infusion or for 12 hours after the third 160 mg bolus.
- . If at least one cell has passed that does NOT call for Lasix to be given, or at least 12 hours has passed from a sequence of maximum furosemide dosing, you can either start back at 20 mg, give the last known effective dose, or give any dose in between (as determined by the ICU team).
- C. Fluid Bolus (Non-shock, except cell #19):
 - 1. Administer 15 ml/kg PBW normal saline, Plasmalyte, or Ringer's lactate (rounded to the NEAREST 250 cc) or 1 unit of RBCs or 25 grams albumin (choice at discretion of physician) over less than or equal to 1 hour then reassess patient . For cells 5,6,9,10, reassess within one hour. For cells 13,14,19, reassess within four hours. Administer up to 3 boluses over 24 hours if indicated by protocol. This 24 hour period begins with the first protocol-mandated non-shock bolus OR the first protocol-mandated bolus following shock reversal.

2. Additional fluid boluses are allowed at the discretion of the physician.

- D. Fluid Bolus (Cell #19 only):
 - 1. Withhold fluid bolus if: Cardiac index (CI) is greater than or equal to 4.5 **OR** FiO2 is greater than or equal to 0.7.
 - 2. Use 15 ml/kg PBW normal saline, Plasmalyte, or Ringer's lactate (rounded to the NEAREST 250 cc) or 1 unit of RBCs or 25 grams albumin (physicians discretion) over less than or equal to 1 hour then reassess patient within 4 hours. Administer up to 3 bolises over 24 hours if indicated by protocol. This 24 hour period begins with the first protocol mandated non-shock bolus OR the first protocol mandated bolus following shock reversal.
 - 3. Additional fluid boluses are allowed at the discretion of the physician.

E. KVO IV:

1. Also minimize as much as possible all other fluid volume (e.g., for delivery of antibiotics etc.), except as required for nutrition support.

F. Guidelines for Management of Shock:

- Shock is defined as a MAP < 60 mmHg or a MAP > 60 while receiving vasopressors.
- Assessments during shock should be recorded at least every 4 hours and at the time of each new entry or exit from a shock cell (cells 1 and 2).
- Physicians have the choice of either fluid bolus and/or vasopressor therapy (in any order) as follows:

1. Fluid Bolus (Shock):

Use 15 ml/kg PBW normal saline, Plasmalyte, or Ringers (rounded to the NEAREST 250 cc) or 1 unit of RBCs or 25 grams albumin (physicians discretion) over less than or equal to 1 hour then reassess patient.

2. Vasopressor Therapy:

Choice of any single agent or any combination of the following:

- a. Dopamine 5 mcg/kg/min, increase to a maximum of 25 mcg/kg/min.
- b. Norepinephrine at 1 mcg/min, increase to a maximum of 100 mcg/min.

- c. Epinephrine at 1 mcg/min, increase to a maximum of 20 mcg/min.
- d. Phenylephrine at 10 mcg/min, increase to a maximum of 500 mcg/min.
- e. Intravenous Vasopressin 0.005-0.04 international units/minute

3. Vasopressor Weaning (includes any dose of dopamine):

- a. When MAP > 60 mmHg on a stable dose of vasopressor, begin reduction of the vasopressor by greater than or equal to 25% of the stabilizing dose at intervals of less than or equal to 4 hours to maintain MAP greater than or equal to 60 mmHg.
- b. Dopamine is considered "discontinued" for vasopressor use and cell assignment when it is weaned to less than or equal to 5 mcg/kg/min, but should continue to be weaned per protocol (footnote F.3.a. above).

G. Invalid PAOP

- 1. If a valid PAOP measurement cannot be obtained, use the pulmonary artery diastolic pressure to estimate the PAOP, based upon the most recently available relationship between PAOP and PADP, and assuming a stable arithmetic difference between the two values. For example, if the most recent prior valid measurements showed a PAOP = 10 and a PADP = 15, and the current PADP = 20 and a valid PAOP cannot be obtained, then assume a current PAOP = 15.
- 2. If neither a valid PAOP nor PADP can be obtained, then utilize the current CVP value.
- * Renal Failure
 - a. Dialysis dependence is defined as the period from the initiation of dialysis to the time that continuous dialysis is discontinued or to the time following the last session of intermittent dialysis.
 - b. During this period of dialysis dependence, urine output is considered to be adequate for the purposes of cell assignment.

Appendix I

FACTT Algorithm: Composite Protocol-Version 2

Intravascular Pressure		MAP < 60 mm Hg	MAP ≥ 60 mm Hg AND off vasopressors (Dopamine ≤ 5 mcg/kg/min is <i>not</i> a vasopressor)					
CVP PAOP ^G		dopamine >5	Average UOP	< 0.5 ml/kg/hr	Average UOP ≥ 0.5 ml/kg/hr			
Conservative	Liberal	Conservative	Liberal	mcg/kg/min or any dose of another vasopressor. Consider correctable causes of shock first.	Ineffective Circulation C.I. < 2.5 OR Cold & mottled with capillary refill >2 sec	Effective Circulation C.I. ≥ 2.5 OR Absence of ineffective circulation criteria	Ineffective Circulation C.I. < 2.5 OR Cold & mottled with capillary refill > 2 sec	Effective Circulation C.I. ≥ 2.5 OR Absence of ineffective circulation criteria
	Ran	ge I		Cell number	KVO IV 3	KVO IV 7	KVO IV 11	KVO IV 15
> 13	> 18	> 18	> 24	1	Dobutamine Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	Furosemide	Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}	Furosemide
Range II			KVO IV 4 Dobutamine ^A	KVO IV 8 Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 12 Dobutamine ^A	KVO IV 16 Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}		
9-13	15-18	13-18	19-24	Vasopressor ^F Fluid bolus ^F				
Range III		2	Fluid bolus ^C 5	Fluid bolus ^C 9	Fluid bolus ^C 13	Liberal: 17 KVO IV		
4-8	10-14	8-12	S to 14-18	uperscript-refers footnotes				Conservative : <i>18</i> Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}
	Rang	ge IV		Fluid bolus ^F	Fluid bolus ^C 6	Fluid bolus ^C 10	Fluid bolus ^C 14	Liberal: 19 Fluid bolus ^D
< 4	< 10	< 8	< 14	Vasopressor ^F				Conservative: KVO IV 20

Algorithm Version 2, rev. 10/12/2000 FACTT Study Version II ARDSNet Study 05 NOTE: numbers in upper right hand corner of each cell = cell numbers; superscripts refer to footnotes that may modify instructions.

FACTT ALGORITHM: CVC Conservative

	MAP < 60 mm Hg	MAP ≥ 60 mm Hg AND off vasopressors (Dopamine ≤ 5 mcg/kg/min is <i>not</i> a vasopressor)					
Central	>5 mcg/kg/min or	Average UOP	< 0.5 ml/kg/hr	Average UOP ≥ 0.5 ml/kg/hr			
Venous Pressure (mmHg)	any dose of another vasopressor Consider correctable causes of shock first.	Ineffective Circulation Cold & mottled with capillary refill >2 sec (all 3 criteria present)	Effective Circulation Absence of ineffective circulation criteria	Ineffective Circulation Cold & mottled <i>with</i> capillary refill > 2 sec (all 3 criteria present)	Effective Circulation Absence of ineffective circulation criteria		
> 13	1*	KVO IV 3 Dobutamine ^A Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 7 Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 11 Dobutamine ^A Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}	KVO IV 15 Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}		
9-13	Vasopressor ^F ⁺ Fluid bolus ^F	KVO IV 4 Dobutamine ^A	KVO IV 8 Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 12 Dobutamine ^A	KVO IV 16 Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}		
	2	Fluid bolus ^C 5	Fluid bolus ^C 9	Fluid bolus ^C 13	18		
4-8					Furosemide		
< 4	Fluid bolus ^F Vasopressor ^F	Fluid bolus ^C 6	Fluid bolus ^C 10	Fluid bolus ^C 14	20 KVO IV GOAL CELL		

Algorithm Version 2, rev. 10/12/2000 FACTT Study Version II ARDSNet Study 05

FACTT Algorithm: CVC Liberal

	MAP < 60 mm Hg	MAP ≥ 60 mm Hg AND off vasopressors (Dopamine ≤ 5 mcg/kg/min is <i>not</i> a vasopressor)					
Central	>5 mcg/kg/min or	Average UOP	< 0.5 ml/kg/hr	Average UOP	Average UOP ≥ 0.5 ml/kg/hr		
Venous Pressure (mmHg) any dose of another vasopressor Consider correctable causes of shock first.		Ineffective Circulation Cold & mottled with capillary refill >2 sec (all 3 criteria present)	Effective Circulation Absence of ineffective circulation criteria	Ineffective Circulation Cold & mottled <i>with</i> capillary refill 2 sec (all 3 criteria present)	Effective Circulation Absence of ineffective circulation criteria		
> 18	1*	KVO IV 3 Dobutamine ^A Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 7 Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 11 Dobutamine ^A Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}	KVO IV 15 Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}		
15-18	Vasopressor ^F † Fluid bolus ^F	KVO IV 4 Dobutamine ^A	KVO IV 8 Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 12 Dobutamine ^A	KVO IV 16 Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}		
	2	Fluid bolus ^C 5	Fluid bolus ^C 9	Fluid bolus ^C 13	17 KVO IV GOAL CELL		
10-14		C		C			
< 10	Fluid bolus ^F Vasopressor ^F	Fluid bolus 6	Huid bolus 10	Fluid bolus 14	19 Fluid bolus ^D		

Algorithm Version 2, rev. 10/12/2000 FACTT Study Version II ARDSNet Study 05

FACTT ALGORITHM: PAC Conservative

		MAP < 60 mm Hg	MAP ≥ 60 mm Hg AND off vasopressors (Dopamine ≤ 5 mcg/kg/min is <i>not</i> a vasopressor)				
Pulmonary	CVP (mm Ha)	dopamine >5	Average UOP	< 0.5 ml/kg/hr	Average hr UOP ≥ 0.5 ml/kg/hr		
Artery Occlusion Pressure (mm Hg)	Use only if PA occlusion pressure unobtainable	mcg/kg/min or any dose of another vasopressor. Consider correctable causes of shock first.	Ineffective Circulation C.I. < 2.5 (or cold & mottled with capillary refill >2 sec if CI unavailable)	Effective Circulation C.I. ≥ 2.5 (or absence of ineffective circulation criteria if CI unavailable)	Ineffective Circulation C.I. < 2.5 (or Cold & mottled with capillary refill > 2 sec if CI unavailable)	Effective Circulation C.I. ≥ 2.5 (or <i>absence</i> of ineffective circulation criteria if CI unavailable)	
>18	>13	1*	KVO IV 3 Dobutamine ^A Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 7 Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 11 Dobutamine ^A Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}	KVO IV 15 Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}	
13-18	9-13	Vasopressor ^F † Fluid bolus ^F	KVO IV 4 Dobutamine ^A	KVO IV 8 Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 12 Dobutamine ^A	KVO IV 16 Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}	
8-12	4-8	2	Fluid bolus ^C 5	Fluid bolus ^C 9	Fluid bolus ^C 13	18 Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}	
<8	<4	Fluid bolus ^F Vasopressor ^F	Fluid bolus ^C 6	Fluid bolus ^C 10	Fluid bolus ^C 14	20 KVO IV GOAL CELL	

Algorithm Version 2, rev. 10/12/2000 FACTT Study Version II ARDSNet Study 05

FACTT ALGORITHM: PAC Liberal

		MAP < 60 mm Hg	MAP ≥ 60 mm Hg AND off vasopressors (Dopamine ≤ 5 mcg/kg/min is <i>not</i> a vasopressor)				
Pulmonary (mm Ha)		>5 mcg/kg/min or	Average UOP	< 0.5 ml/kg/hr	Average UOP ≥ 0.5 ml/kg/hr		
Artery Occlusion Pressure (mm Hg)	Use only if PA occlusion pressure unobtainable	any dose of another vasopressor. Consider correctable causes of shock first.	Ineffective Circulation C.I. < 2.5 (or cold & mottled with capillary refill >2 sec if CI unavailable)	Effective Circulation C.I. ≥ 2.5 (or absence of ineffective circulation criteria if CI unavailable)	Ineffective Circulation C.I. < 2.5 (or cold & mottled with capillary refill > 2 sec if CI unavailable)	Effective Circulation C.I. ≥ 2.5 (or absence of ineffective circulation criteria if CI unavailable)	
>24	>18	1*	KVO IV 3 Dobutamine ^A Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 7 Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 11 Dobutamine ^A Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}	KVO IV 15 Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}	
			KVO IV 4 Dobutamine ^A	KVO IV 8 Furosemide ^{B.1,2,4}	KVO IV 12 Dobutamine ^A	KVO IV 16 Furosemide ^{B.1,3,4}	
19-24	15-18	Vasopressor ^F † Fluid bolus ^F					
14-19	10-14	2	Fluid bolus ^C 5	Fluid bolus ^C 9	Fluid bolus ^C 13	17 KVO IV GOAL CELL	
14-10	10-14		Fluid bolus ^C 6	Fluid bolus ^C 10	Fluid bolus ^C 14	19	
<14	<10	Fluid bolus ^F Vasopressor ^F				Fluid bolus ^D	

Algorithm Version 2, rev. 10/12/2000 FACTT Study Version II ARDSNet Study 05