

1 **Solid-state esophageal pressure sensor for the estimation of pleural**
2 **pressure: a bench and first-in-human validation study**

3

4 Julien P. van Oosten¹, Nico Goedendorp¹, Amne Mousa^{2,3}, Rutger Flink⁴, Rik Schaart⁴,
5 Merel Flinsenbergh¹, Peter Somhorst¹, Diederik A.M.P.J. Gommers¹, Leo Heunks⁵,
6 Annemijn H. Jonkman¹

7

8 **Author affiliations:**

9

1) Intensive Care, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

10

2) Intensive Care, Amsterdam UMC location Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The
11 Netherlands

12

3) Amsterdam Cardiovascular Sciences, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

13

4) Pulmotech B.V., Leek, The Netherlands

14

5) Intensive Care, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

15

16 **Correspondence to:** Dr. Julien van Oosten, e-mail address: j.vanoosten@erasmusmc.nl;
17 work address: Dr. Molewaterplein 40, 3015 GD Rotterdam, Intensive Care Volwassenen

18

19 **Running title:** Solid state esophageal catheter validation

20

21 **Word count:** 3564

22

23 **Keywords:** Solid-state sensor, esophageal catheter, respiratory monitoring, pleural
24 pressure, mechanical ventilation

25 ABSTRACT

26 **Word count:** 294

27 **Background:** Advanced respiratory monitoring through the measurement of esophageal
28 pressure (Pes) as a surrogate of pleural pressure helps guiding mechanical ventilation in ICU
29 patients. Pes measurement with an esophageal balloon catheter, the current clinical
30 reference standard, needs complex calibrations and a multitude of factors influence its
31 reliability. Solid-state pressure sensors might be able to overcome these limitations.

32

33 **Objectives:** To evaluate the accuracy of a new solid-state Pes transducer (Pes_{solid}). We
34 hypothesized that measurements are non-inferior to those obtained with a properly
35 calibrated balloon catheter (Pes_{bal}).

36

37 **Methods:** Absolute and relative solid-state sensor Pes measurements were compared to a
38 reference pressure in a 5-day bench setup, and to simultaneously placed balloon catheters
39 in 15 spontaneously breathing healthy volunteers and in 16 mechanically ventilated ICU
40 patients. Bland-Altman analysis was performed with nonparametric bootstrapping to
41 estimate bias and upper and lower limits of agreement (LoA).

42

43 **Results:** *Bench study:* Solid-state pressure transducers had a positive bias ($P_{\text{solid}} - P_{\text{ref}}$) of
44 around 1 cmH₂O for the absolute minimal and maximum pressures, and no bias for pressure
45 swings. *Healthy volunteers:* the solid-state transducer revealed a bias (Pes_{solid}-Pes_{bal}) [upper
46 LoA; lower LoA] of 1.58 [8.19; -5.03], -2.37 [3.96; -8.69] and 3.94 [11.09; -3.20] cmH₂O for
47 end-expiratory, end-inspiratory and Δ Pes values, respectively. *ICU patients:* the solid-state
48 transducer showed a bias (Pes_{solid}-Pes_{bal}) [upper LoA; lower LoA] during controlled / assisted

49 ventilation of: -0.15 [1.39; -1.70] / -0.20 [5.02; -5.41], 0.32 [3.35; -2.72] / -0.54 [4.60; -5.68]
50 and 0.47 [3.79; -2.85] / 0.35 [3.88; -3.18] cmH₂O for end-expiratory, end-inspiratory and
51 Δ Pes values, respectively. LoA were <2cmH₂O for static measurements on controlled
52 ventilation.

53

54 **Conclusions:** the novel solid-state pressure transducer showed good accuracy on the bench,
55 in healthy volunteers and in ventilated ICU-patients. This could contribute to the
56 implementation of Pes as advanced respiratory monitoring technique.

57

58 **Trial registration:** Clinicaltrials.gov identifier: NCT05817968 (patient study). Registered on
59 18 April 2023.

60 INTRODUCTION

61 Advanced respiratory monitoring through the measurement of esophageal pressure
62 (Pes) as a surrogate for pleural pressure helps understanding partitioned respiratory
63 mechanics and breathing effort in mechanically ventilated patients, and could guide the
64 individualization of ventilator settings.[1] Despite the recognized benefits, widespread
65 implementation of esophageal manometry is still in its infancy.[1–4] It requires (technical)
66 expertise and the validation and calibration of balloon catheters is often challenging. For
67 instance, optimal filling volumes vary according to the balloon type, patient factors and
68 ventilator settings, and both excessive and insufficient balloon filling volumes dampen Pes
69 amplitudes.[1,5] In addition, the balloon may empty over time, resulting in an
70 underestimation of pressures. Signal dampening could also occur if compliant tubing is used
71 to connect the catheter to the extracorporeal pressure sensor. Therefore, for correct
72 interpretation of respiratory physiology and optimal patient/ventilator management,
73 adequate balloon position and filling volume should be regularly confirmed with an
74 occlusion test and adjusted accordingly.[1]

75 Pes catheters using a solid-state pressure transducer might be able to overcome
76 some of the above limitations. These sensors measure Pes directly inside the esophagus,
77 allowing a faster frequency response while not being subjected to signal dampening.
78 Previous older studies have used such transducers, but showed unacceptable signal
79 drifting.[6,7] These studies, however, used pressure transducers that were not correctly
80 (temperature) calibrated. Here, we evaluate the accuracy of a new solid-state Pes catheter
81 with a transducer that allows for both temperature and ambient pressure calibration. We
82 hypothesized that measurements are non-inferior as compared to a correctly calibrated

83 balloon catheter. We tested this hypothesis in a bench setup, in healthy volunteers, and in
84 mechanically ventilated patients during controlled and assisted ventilation.

85

86 METHODS

87 For additional details, see Additional file 1.

88

89 **Study design and subjects**

90 This study consisted of: 1) a bench study (September 2023) at the manufacturer
91 location (Pulmotech B.V., Leek, the Netherlands), 2) a prospective study in spontaneously
92 breathing healthy volunteers (August–October 2021) at the intensive care unit (ICU) of the
93 Amsterdam University Medical Center, Amsterdam, the Netherlands (ethics approval
94 number METC 2020.470), and 3) a prospective study in mechanically ventilated ICU patients
95 (October 2023 to March 2024) at the ICU of the Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The
96 Netherlands (ethics approval number MEC-2023-0119; ClinicalTrials.gov: NCT05817968).
97 Extensive technical development tests were performed prior to the healthy volunteer study;
98 these data are not part of this manuscript. Written informed consent was obtained from
99 healthy subjects and patients according to local regulations.

100

101 *Healthy volunteers*

102 We recruited healthy, non-obese adults without history of cardiac and/or pulmonary
103 disease and contraindications for nasogastric catheter placement (e.g., esophageal varices,
104 recent (<2 weeks) nasal bleeding, use of anticoagulants).

105

106 *Patients*

107 Elective adult cardiothoracic surgery patients requiring postoperative invasive
108 controlled mechanical ventilation in the ICU were enrolled pre-surgery. Eligibility was
109 reassessed at ICU arrival. Exclusion criteria were: (1) upper airway/esophageal/mouth or
110 face pathology (i.e. recent surgery, esophageal varices, diaphragmatic hernia), (2) nasal
111 bleeding within the last 2 weeks, (3) presence of pneumothorax, (4) inadequate coagulation,
112 (5) pregnancy.

113

114 **Data collection**

115 We collected sex, age, height, body mass index (BMI), and for the ICU population
116 also the relevant medical history (cardiac and pulmonary diseases), type of surgery
117 performed, vital signs and ventilator settings throughout study procedures. Device-related
118 adverse events were noted.

119

120 **Esophageal manometry**

121 We tested the intelligent Esophageal Pressure Catheter (iEPC) (PulmoTech B.V.), a
122 CE-marked 12 French catheter with a length of 125cm that combines nasogastric feeding
123 with Pes measurements via a solid-state pressure sensor (Additional file 2). The catheter
124 was connected to an acquisition system (iEPMS, PulmoTech B.V. connected to Polybench,
125 Applied Biosignals GmbH, Germany) for data sampling at 200Hz.

126 Measurements were compared with a standard balloon catheter, either the Cooper
127 catheter (Cooper Surgical, USA: 5 French, length 85cm, balloon length 9.5cm – used in
128 healthy volunteers and patients) or the NutriVent™ catheter (Sidam, Italy: 14 French
129 catheter, length 108cm, balloon length 10cm – used in patients). The balloon catheter, an
130 airway pressure (Paw, healthy subjects + patients) and flow sensor (healthy subjects) were

131 connected to an acquisition system (MP160, BIOPAC Systems Inc., USA) for simultaneous
132 recording of waveforms sampled at 200Hz. Waveforms were synchronized with the solid-
133 state sensor tracings offline.

134

135 **Procedures**

136 *Bench*

137 Catheters were exposed to physiological conditions (100% relative humidity and
138 37°C) for 5 days (Additional file 3). Pressure swings of 12 cmH₂O above 10 cmH₂O baseline
139 at a rate of 12/minute were applied using the AVEA (Viasys Healthcare, USA) in conjunction
140 with a humidifier (F&P MR850, New Zealand). Temperature and relative humidity were
141 controlled to maintain 37±2°C and >90%, respectively. Reference pressure (P_{ref}) was
142 measured through a non-compliant tube connected to the setup. Data was recorded at
143 30Hz for the solid-state pressures (P_{solid}), and at 200Hz for P_{ref} (iEPMS, PulmoTech B.V.).

144

145 *Healthy volunteers*

146 Catheter placement/calibration

147 Prior to insertion, the solid-state sensor was calibrated according to the
148 manufacturer's instructions (see Additional file 1). Both catheters were inserted aimed at
149 measuring P_{es} in the mid-esophageal range; location of the sensor corresponded to
150 approximately halfway the balloon. Esophageal placement was confirmed by cardiac
151 artifacts/esophageal spasms on the pressure waveforms. Balloon filling volume was checked
152 with the Baydur maneuver (end-expiratory occlusion test) and adjusted when needed (see
153 Additional file 1). The $\Delta P_{es_{bal}}/\Delta P_{aw}$ ratio was targeted at 0.9-1.1 for higher accuracy. If this
154 range was not reached after five maneuvers, a range of 0.8-1.2 was accepted.

155 Measurements

156 Recordings were obtained with subjects in sitting, semi-recumbent, supine and
157 prone position. Balloon catheter accuracy was verified in between position changes. In each
158 body position, 2 minutes of Pes during unloaded tidal breathing was acquired. During sitting
159 and semi-recumbent position, subjects were additionally shortly exposed to three levels of
160 inspiratory effort to obtain a variable within-subject range of effort (thus Pes values), using
161 a threshold loading device (Power Breathe, POWERbreathe Ltd, UK), see Additional file 1.

162

163 *Patients*

164 The study protocol was initiated directly after surgery upon arrival on the ICU.
165 Ventilator settings were according to clinical protocols.

166

167 Catheter placement/calibration

168 Catheter positioning and calibration were similar as to healthy volunteers, while
169 patients were still deeply sedated. Position was verified with thoracic X-ray when made
170 within standard of care and/or using video laryngoscopy. The NutriVent catheter was
171 initially used as comparator; however, in the first four patients, interference between both
172 catheters was observed (see Results). From the 5th patient, the Cooper catheter was used
173 instead.

174

175 Measurements

176 During controlled ventilation, 10 minutes of tidal breathing were recorded, and three
177 end-inspiratory and end-expiratory holds were performed (at 0, 5 and 10 minutes) for static
178 measurements. Another 10-minute recording was performed during partially assisted

179 ventilation when spontaneous breathing resumed as per clinical care. Correct balloon filling
180 volume was verified at the start of each recording. Catheters were removed upon study
181 completion.

182

183 **Offline analysis**

184 For the bench study, the minimum, maximum and delta pressures were calculated
185 using custom software (Polybench, Applied BioSignals, Germany). At each measurement
186 time point, a median for each parameter was calculated over 60 preceding artificial breaths
187 for further analyses.

188 For the healthy volunteers and patient studies, signal processing and analyses were
189 performed in MATLAB (Mathworks, USA). Periods or individual breaths with substantial
190 artifacts (e.g., esophageal spasms, coughing) were removed. Signals were processed using a
191 2nd-order 5 Hz low-pass Butterworth filter followed by a 0.1 second unweighted moving
192 average filter. Static measurements for end-expiratory and end-inspiratory holds (in
193 patients) and the Baydur maneuver ($\Delta P_{es_{bal}}/\Delta P_{aw}$ and $\Delta P_{es_{solid}}/\Delta P_{aw}$) were manually
194 selected from the tracings. Whereas the $\Delta P_{es_{bal}}/\Delta P_{aw}$ was used to verify balloon filling
195 volume throughout the study, for the solid-state pressure transducer the Baydur test served
196 as offline measure for sensor stability (as this catheter only requires zeroing before
197 insertion). A breath detection algorithm was used and absolute values for end-inspiratory
198 P_{es} , end-expiratory P_{es} and the resulting inspiratory amplitude (ΔP_{es}) were computed
199 breath-by-breath for both signals (in cmH₂O).

200

201 *Endpoints*

202 For the bench study, P_{solid} was compared to P_{ref} . For healthy subjects and patients,
203 the primary endpoint was the difference in absolute P_{es} values between the solid-state
204 sensor and balloon catheter ($P_{\text{es}_{\text{solid}}} - P_{\text{es}_{\text{bal}}}$), measured at end-expiration and peak
205 inspiration, and the difference in relative P_{es} values (i.e., inspiratory amplitude) between
206 both catheters ($\Delta P_{\text{es}_{\text{solid}}} - \Delta P_{\text{es}_{\text{bal}}}$). Endpoints were separated for the different ventilation
207 modes/populations. Secondary endpoints were the stability of the solid-state catheter as
208 from repeated Baydur values, and device-related adverse events.

209

210 **Sample size**

211 Sixteen catheters were tested on the bench; a convenience sample based on
212 standard deviations (SD) obtained in the manufacturer's previous technical tests. These
213 tests were also used to substantiate sample sizes for the in-human studies, resulting in 7
214 subjects required for Bland-Altman analyses for each study, assuming a type-I error of 0.05
215 and type-II error of 0.20, and the following variables: expected mean (SD) of difference: 0.79
216 (0.53) cmH_2O ; maximum allowed difference between methods: 3.5 cmH_2O , based on
217 pressure accuracy tests and sensor drift tests (Pulmotech B.V.). We enrolled a larger sample
218 (15 healthy subjects, 16 patients) to allow for more variability, to increase user-experience
219 and to account for potential clinical/technical challenges.

220

221 **Statistical analysis**

222 Statistical analyses were performed in R (RStudio, version 2024.02.2, Posit Software,
223 PBC). For the bench, mean difference (i.e., $P_{\text{solid}} - P_{\text{ref}}$), and upper and lower limits of
224 agreement (LoA) were calculated for each measurement time point. For the healthy
225 volunteer and patient studies, baseline demographics and/or ventilator settings are

226 presented as median (interquartile range, IQR) or numbers (%). Bland-Altman analysis with
227 bootstrapping to account for variable number of breaths across subjects was performed to
228 compare Pes values between catheters (see Additional file 1). For the healthy volunteers
229 where variability in inspiratory effort was introduced with loaded breathing, agreement
230 between Pes values for the solid-state vs. balloon was also evaluated with simple linear
231 regression.

232

233 RESULTS

234 **Bench study**

235 The 16 solid-state sensors demonstrated a small positive bias ($P_{\text{solid}} - P_{\text{ref}}$) that
236 increased from 0 to approximately 1.5 cmH₂O during the first 10 hours for the absolute
237 minimal and maximum pressures, and then remained stable at around 1 cmH₂O until 120
238 hours (Figure 1AB). There was a negligible bias for pressure swings (0.13 cmH₂O) throughout
239 the full study (Figure 1C).

240

241 **Healthy volunteers**

242 Fifteen healthy subjects (male/female 3/12; age 35.5±13.5 years) completed the
243 study without adverse events. Two subjects were excluded from the full analysis, because of
244 balloon catheter dislocation early in the study and inability to obtain reliable recordings
245 after this was noticed (n=1), or balloon Baydur ($\Delta P_{\text{es}_{\text{bal}}}/\Delta P_{\text{aw}}$) exceeding the 0.8-1.2 range
246 throughout the study (n=1). For other subjects (n=5), short sections with low signal quality
247 were removed (i.e., many esophageal spasms and/or cardiac artefacts, or $\Delta P_{\text{es}_{\text{bal}}}/\Delta P_{\text{aw}}$ not
248 within 0.8-1.2 range for a specific body position).

249

250 *Comparisons*

251 Figure 2 shows examples of Pes_{bal} and Pes_{solid} tracings. A total of 563 breaths of
252 thirteen subjects were included in analyses when accepting tracings with $\Delta Pes_{bal}/\Delta Paw$
253 within the 0.9-1.1 range. Bland-Altman analyses (Figure 3) revealed a bias (i.e., $Pes_{solid} -$
254 Pes_{bal}) [upper LoA; lower LoA] of 1.58 [8.19; -5.03], -2.37 [3.96; -8.69] and 3.94 [11.09; -3.20]
255 cmH_2O for end-expiratory, end-inspiratory and ΔPes values, respectively. Pes_{bal} and Pes_{solid}
256 values showed moderate to good correlations (Additional files 4-6), with an average R^2 of
257 0.70, 0.82 and 0.84 for end-expiratory, end-inspiratory and ΔPes values, respectively.

258 The average $\Delta Pes_{bal}/\Delta Paw$ was 0.87 ± 0.26 (min-max: 0.39-1.12; n=97 maneuvers),
259 indicating that the balloon required frequent recalibrations after e.g. body position changes
260 before adequate comparisons with Pes_{solid} could be made. For the solid-state catheter,
261 Baydur maneuvers were analyzed offline to determine sensor stability. Of the 98 maneuvers
262 analysed, $\Delta Pes_{solid}/\Delta Paw$ ratio was 1.01 ± 0.14 [min-max: 0.74-1.54]; 10 measurements (of
263 which 4 from one subject) exceeded the 0.8-1.2 range.

264 We performed two sensitivity analysis: 1) when accepting tracings with $\Delta Pes_{bal}/\Delta Paw$
265 within the 0.8-1.2 range, 877 breaths were included, resulting in comparable bias and LoA
266 (Additional File 7); 2) when selecting only tracings with both $\Delta Pes_{solid}/\Delta Paw$ and
267 $\Delta Pes_{bal}/\Delta Paw$ ratios between 0.9-1.1 and excluding one subject where cardiac artifacts
268 amplitudes exceeded 5 cmH_2O in both signals, 357 breaths from 11 subjects were used,
269 resulting in a lower bias [upper LoA; lower LoA]: 0.68 [7.80; -6.44], -2.08 [3.21; -7.37] and
270 2.77 [9.42; -3.89] cmH_2O for end-expiratory, end-inspiratory and ΔPes values, respectively.

271

272 **Patients**

273 27 patients consented prior to their surgery, and 16 patients (see Table 1 for
274 characteristics) were eventually enrolled upon ICU arrival. Reasons for withdrawal were a
275 last-minute canceled/rescheduled surgery (n=10) and hemodynamic instability (n=1). One
276 patient was excluded from the full analysis, as the solid-state sensor demonstrated non-
277 physiological signals (i.e., Pes swings exceeding Paw) and the Nutrivent catheter was
278 unreliable due to balloon emptying despite recalibration attempts (Additional file 8). For
279 controlled ventilation, one additional patient was excluded due to balloon (Cooper) catheter
280 emptying (but included for assisted ventilation after adequate recalibration). For assisted
281 ventilation, three additional patients were excluded (but included in controlled ventilation
282 analysis) due to: technical issues (n=1), very low breathing efforts (n=1), many artifacts
283 hampering breath detection (n=1). This resulted in a total analysis set of 2200 breaths from
284 14 patients during controlled ventilation and 889 breaths from 12 patients during assisted
285 ventilation; all Pes_{bal} tracings were adequately calibrated with a Baydur maneuver between
286 0.9-1.1. No adverse events were reported.

287

288 *Signal interference*

289 Signal interference between the solid-state and Nutrivent catheter is explained in
290 Additional file 9, likely the result of having two rather thick catheters (with large balloon of
291 Nutrivent catheter) in place and rendering parts of the data unusable for further analysis.
292 After using the Cooper catheter (from the 5th patient), such interference was not observed.

293

294 *Comparisons*

295 Figure 4 shows Pes_{bal} and Pes_{solid} tracings during controlled and assisted ventilation.
296 During controlled ventilation, Bland-Altman analyses (Figure 5A-C) revealed a low bias (i.e.,

297 $P_{es_{solid}} - P_{es_{bal}}$) [upper LoA; lower LoA] of -0.15 [1.39; -1.70], 0.32 [3.35; -2.72] and 0.47
298 [3.79; -2.85] cmH₂O for end-expiratory, end-inspiratory and ΔP_{es} values, respectively.
299 Patient 16 demonstrated inspiratory pressure amplifications in $P_{es_{solid}}$ that we could not
300 attribute to cardiac artifacts solely (Additional file 10). Removing this patient improved
301 comparisons: bias [upper LoA; lower LoA] of -0.08 [1.43; -1.58], 0.07 [2.62; -2.49] and 0.15
302 [2.63; -2.34] cmH₂O for end-expiratory, end-inspiratory and ΔP_{es} values, respectively.

303 Pressures obtained during static conditions are presented in Table 2; LoA were
304 smaller (all <2 cmH₂O) as compared to breath-by-breath analysis.

305 During assisted ventilation, bias remained low, but LoAs were wider, yet smaller than
306 in healthy volunteers (Figure 6): -0.20 [5.02; -5.41], -0.54 [4.60; -5.68] and 0.35 [3.88; -3.18]
307 cmH₂O for end-expiratory, end-inspiratory and ΔP_{es} values, respectively.

308 A total of 24 Baydur maneuvers from the solid-state catheter were analyzed to
309 determine sensor stability (for n=12 patients in controlled ventilation (2 missing as
310 acquisition started after balloon calibration) and for n=12 patients in assisted mode). The
311 mean $\Delta P_{es_{solid}}/\Delta P_{aw}$ ratio was 1.05 ± 0.18 [min-max: 0.72-1.48].

312

313 DISCUSSION

314 We tested a new P_{es} catheter with solid-state sensor on the bench, in healthy
315 volunteers and in ventilated patients. Findings can be summarized as: 1) the solid-state
316 sensor demonstrated excellent agreement with a reference pressure during a 5-day bench
317 test, without signal drift; 2) moderate to good agreements with $P_{es_{bal}}$ during tidal breathing
318 was found in healthy volunteers when $P_{es_{bal}}$ was adequately calibrated; 3) these
319 agreements improved in ventilated patients during tidal breathing (controlled and assisted

320 ventilation) and further in static conditions (breath holds); 4) the sensor remained stable
321 throughout study recordings; 5) the solid-state Pes catheter often measured higher ΔP_{es}
322 values, especially in healthy volunteers during high efforts.

323

324 *Validity of reference pressure*

325 For our in-human comparisons, balloon Pes catheters served as “reference standard”
326 as the true pleural pressure is not available in humans. A concern with this approach in our
327 and previous studies[6-9] is that each balloon has an optimal filling volume, depending on
328 its perimeter/length, and elasticity and length of connecting tubing. These characteristics,
329 but also the balloon’s position in the esophagus and ex-vivo pressure sensor affect absolute
330 pressure values and the balloon’s capacity to respond to Pes swings (i.e., frequency
331 response)[10]. Furthermore, the balloon may empty over time and recommended filling
332 volumes by manufacturers are often not optimal clinically; changes in intrathoracic pressure
333 or chest wall compliance (e.g. change in PEEP, body position, pleural pressure
334 inhomogeneities) require recalibration[1,3,10,11]. Indeed, uncalibrated and calibrated
335 balloon pressures (i.e., corrected for esophageal wall and balloon elasticity) could differ at
336 end-expiration by 5.1 cmH₂O (range: 0.8 to 35.1 cmH₂O) despite obtaining a Baydur range of
337 0.8-1.2.[10] This makes the position of balloon catheters as reference standard somewhat
338 questionable. We aimed to target higher balloon catheter accuracy for primary comparisons
339 ($\Delta P_{es_{bal}}/\Delta P_{aw}$ within 0.9-1.1 range) to improve comparisons, but this was sometimes
340 challenging in healthy volunteers. A Baydur range of 0.8-1.2 is considered acceptable in
341 literature[1] but also implies an accepted deviation of 20% from the true ΔP_{es} value, which
342 may impact clinical decision-making when applying Pes-based ventilation strategies.
343 Considering the solid-state sensor stability, represented by the excellent offline obtained

344 $\Delta P_{\text{es}_{\text{solid}}}/\Delta P_{\text{aw}}$ (1.01 ± 0.14 in healthy volunteers, 1.05 ± 0.18 in patients) and bench results, it
345 can also be argued that the solid-state sensor better represented the actual (Δ) Pes.
346 Studies comparing different Pes sensor types (i.e., solid-state, balloons [11], liquid-filled
347 catheters) are therefore challenging to interpret without the clinical availability of a true
348 reference standard.

349

350 *Related works*

351 Over 20 years ago, solid-state Pes catheters were compared with a balloon catheter
352 in healthy volunteers[6,8] demonstrating reliable relative/ Δ Pes values. However,
353 uncontrollable offset shifts (10 cmH₂O for transpulmonary pressure[6]) and a high bias (>
354 cmH₂O[8]) were observed, making absolute values unreliable. Authors hypothesized that
355 Van der Waal forces contributed to falsely high pressures (e.g., mucus sticking to sensor
356 membrane, or contact with the esophageal wall)[6] and negative signal drifts[8]. More
357 recent work in 2017[7] and 2021[9] comparing micro-transducers with balloon catheters
358 report a smaller bias: end-expiratory Pes of -3.6 cmH₂O[7] (vs. 1.6 cmH₂O in our study) and
359 Δ Pes of 3.8 cmH₂O[9] (vs. 3.9 cmH₂O in our study), respectively.

360 The smaller[6, 8] or comparable[7, 9] biases in our healthy volunteers can be
361 explained as follows. First, our solid-state catheter includes a small balloon above the sensor
362 serving as a stabilizer to avoid sensor sticking to the esophageal wall; this likely also kept
363 mucus off the sensor membrane, avoiding signal drifts. Second, the sensor is both
364 temperature and humidity calibrated. Yet, in some subjects/patients large differences with
365 $P_{\text{es}_{\text{bal}}}$ were found, which may be explained by the sensor's fast frequency response: since
366 pressures are measured directly inside the esophagus signal dampening is avoided, but
367 artifacts can be easily amplified. Cardiac artifacts in $P_{\text{es}_{\text{solid}}}$ were sometimes high and body

368 position dependent (e.g., more marked in supine position, see Additional file 11, in line
369 with[8]), and more negative Pes values were observed with larger inspiratory efforts (Figure
370 2). This warrants careful identification and interpretation of artifacts, improved signal
371 filtering at the bedside, and/or optimizing the sensor positioning. The smaller biases and
372 LoA in ICU patients as compared to healthy volunteers could be explained by the stable
373 ventilator settings and the low variability in breathing efforts during assisted mode. In
374 addition, body position alterations were not part of the patient study.

375

376 *Strengths and limitations*

377 This is the first study validating a novel solid-state Pes catheter, combining bench
378 work with measurement in healthy volunteers and ICU patients during different ventilation
379 modes. The use of the solid-state Pes catheter was considered easy: it requires only one
380 calibration prior to insertion and pressures are measured directly in the esophagus – hence,
381 some secondary limitations of balloon catheters (e.g., need for precise filling volume, risks
382 of balloon emptying over time) are not applicable. In contrast, with the sensor’s fast
383 response time, there is a possibility of pressure amplifications related to e.g., cardiac
384 artifacts as discussed above. Our study also has some limitations. First, we used two
385 different balloon catheters in the patient study, which was initially designed with the
386 Nutrivent catheter as comparator, but significant interference was observed. Second,
387 several short sections were excluded from the analysis due to artifacts in both signals
388 and/or unreliable Pes_{bal} tracings. Nevertheless, when selecting stable tracings where the
389 balloon was properly calibrated, good agreement between Pes_{bal} and Pes_{solid} was found.
390 Since our sample size was larger than necessary, excluding some tracings likely did not
391 affect power of our analyses. Third, in healthy volunteers we measured positive and high

392 end-expiratory Pes values, likely the result of inspiratory effort maneuvers and/or cardiac
393 artifacts. In addition, two patients demonstrated unphysiologically high Pes_{solid} values (see
394 Results) despite proper calibration, reposition attempts and verification of esophageal
395 positioning. Last, we did not perform multiple-day testing of the solid-state catheter in the
396 ICU, but extensive bench tests demonstrated only minimal signal drift over 5 days.

397

398 *Clinical relevance*

399 Pes monitoring allows individualization of ventilator settings via a more thorough
400 understanding of the mechanical properties of the respiratory system. Over the last years,
401 use of the balloon catheters has improved with the availability of dedicated monitors or
402 ventilator connections. Yet, measurements remain technically challenging and widespread
403 routine implementation is lacking. The solid-state catheter requires only one calibration
404 prior to insertion, contributing to its ease of use. This makes the technique interesting for
405 future implementation, also in the light of the recent regulatory challenges such as the
406 medical device regulation in the European Union, which has put extensive pressure on the
407 production of medical devices, resulting in limited availability and even withdrawal of
408 certain balloon catheters from the market. Future work should focus on the longer-term use
409 of the technique, e.g., in multiple-day measurements within a Pes-guided ventilation
410 strategy, and optimizing filtering of (cardiac) artifacts and (automated) signal quality checks.

411 In conclusion, this is the first study validating a novel solid-state Pes catheter in vitro,
412 in healthy volunteers and in postoperative mechanically ventilated ICU-patients, with
413 promising results. This could contribute to the implementation of Pes as advanced
414 respiratory monitoring technique.

415 LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

416	BMI	Body Mass Index
417	ICU	Intensive Care Unit
418	iEPC	Intelligent Esophageal Pressure Catheter
419	iEPMS	Intelligent Esophageal Pressure Monitoring System
420	LoA	Limit of Agreement
421	Paw	Airway pressure
422	Pes	Esophageal pressure
423	Pes _{bal}	Esophageal pressure measured by balloon catheter
424	P _{ref}	Reference pressure
425	P _{solid}	Esophageal pressure measured by the solid-state pressure sensor

426 DECLARATIONS

427 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

428 This study was approved by the local medical ethics committee of the Vrije Universiteit medical
429 center (METc 2020.470) and Erasmus Medical Center (MEC-2023-0119). All healthy subjects and
430 patients provided written informed consent prior to participation.

431

432 **Consent for publication**

433 Not applicable

434

435 **Availability of data and materials**

436 The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding
437 author upon reasonable request.

438

439 **Competing interests**

440 RF and RS are employed by Pulmotech B.V. AJ and LH received research funding (paid to the
441 institution) of Pulmotech B.V. for the conduct of the study.

442

443 **Funding**

444 The study was partially funded by a grant from Pulmotech B.V., Leek, The Netherlands.

445

446 **Authors contributions**

447 Concept: AHJ, RF, LH; Design: LH, AHJ; Data acquisition bench study: RF, RS; Data acquisition healthy
448 volunteers: AM, LH, AHJ; Data acquisition patients: JPvO, NG, RF, RS, AHJ; Data analysis: JPvO, NG,
449 AM, RF, MF, LH, AHJ; Data interpretation: all authors; Manuscript drafting: JPvO, NG, AHJ;
450 Supervision: LH, AHJ; Manuscript revising for intellectual content and final approval: all authors.

451

452 **Acknowledgements**

453 We thank all healthy volunteers and patients that were willing to contribute to the study.

454 REFERENCES

- 455 1. Jonkman AH, Telias I, Spinelli E, *et al.* **The oesophageal balloon for respiratory monitoring in**
456 **ventilated patients: updated clinical review and practical aspects.** *Eur Respir Rev* 2023; 32:
457 220186
- 458 2. Talmor D, Sarge T, Malhotra A, *et al.* **Mechanical ventilation guided by esophageal pressure**
459 **in acute lung injury.** *N Engl J Med.* 2008;359(20):2095-2104.
- 460 3. Akoumianaki E, Maggiore SM, Valenza F, *et al.* **The Application of Esophageal Pressure**
461 **Measurement in Patients with Respiratory Failure.** *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.*
462 2014;189(5):520-531.
- 463 4. Brochard L. **Measurement of esophageal pressure at bedside: pros and cons.** *Curr Opin Crit*
464 *Care.* 2014;20(1):39-46.
- 465 5. Mojoli F, Iotti GA, Torriglia F, *et al.* **In vivo calibration of esophageal pressure in the**
466 **mechanically ventilated patient makes measurements reliable.** *Crit Care.* 2016:1-9.
- 467 6. Peters RJA, Meijer H, Kingma R, *et al.* **Evaluation of catheter-mounted transducers for intra-**
468 **oesophageal pressure recording in respiratory function tests.** *Med Biol Eng Comput.*
469 1998;36(5):562-7.
- 470 7. Augusto R, Albuquerque A, Jaeger T, *et al.* **Stability and Agreement of a Microtransducer**
471 **and an Air-Filled Balloon Esophageal Catheter in the Monitoring of Esophageal Pressure.**
472 *Respir Care.* 2017;62(2):215-221.
- 473 8. Stell IM, Tompkins S, Lovell AT, *et al.* **An in vivo comparison of a catheter mounted pressure**
474 **transducer system with conventional balloon catheters.** *Eur Respir J* 1999; 13: 1158-1163.
- 475 9. MacAskill W, Hoffman B, Johnson MA, *et al.* **Pressure measurement characteristics of a**
476 **micro-transducer and balloon catheters.** *Physiol Rep.* 2021;9:14831
- 477 10. Cammarota G, Lauro G, Santangelo E, *et al.* **Mechanical Ventilation Guided by Uncalibrated**
478 **Esophageal Pressure May Be Potentially Harmful.** *Anesthesiology* 2020; 133:145–53
- 479 11. Mojoli F, Chiumello D, Pozzi M, Algieri I, *et al.* **Esophageal pressure measurements under**
480 **different conditions of intrathoracic pressure. An in vitro study of second generation**
481 **balloon catheters.** *Minerva Anesthesiol* 2015;81: 855-64

482
483
484
485
486

487 TABLES

Table 1 Main characteristics of the study population

Characteristic	Total (N = 16)	
Age, years; median (IQR)	65 (58 - 69)	
Male, sex; n (%)	15 (94)	
BMI kg/m ² ; median (IQR)	26.7 (25.0 - 29.7)	
IBW, kg; median (IQR)	76.9 (68.1 - 79.2)	
Medical history (n)		
Asthma	1	
Non-obstructive emphysema	1	
Coronary artery disease	6	
Renal Failure	2	
Type of surgery performed (n)		
CABG	5	
CABG + AVR	2	
ROSS procedure	2	
MVP-MIC	3	
AVR	4	
	Controlled ventilation (median (IQR))	Assisted ventilation (median (IQR))
Respiratory parameters		
PEEP set (cmH ₂ O)	7 (7 - 8)	7 (6 - 8)
PEEP total (cmH ₂ O)	8.5 (7.7 - 9.1)	N/A
PC/PS above PEEP (cmH ₂ O)	11 (10 - 13.3)	7 (5 - 8)
Pplat (cmH ₂ O)	17 (16.2 - 19.7)	N/A
Driving Pressure (cmH ₂ O)	9.5 (7.7-10.7)	N/A
Pocc (cmH ₂ O)	N/A	12.7 (8.4 - 17.3)
RR (/min)	16 (16 - 18)	13 (9 - 15)
Tidal Volume (mL)	484 (448 - 568)	689 (459 - 856)
Minute Volume (L/min)	7.9 (7.0 - 8.7)	6 (5.6 - 7.3)
FiO ₂	30 (30 - 41)	35 (30 - 41)
SpO ₂	98 (97 - 98)	98 (97 - 99)
EtCO ₂	5.4 (4.6 - 5.9)	6.8 (5.8 - 7.3)
Hemodynamic parameters		
Heart rate (/min)	75 (68 - 81)	82 (79 - 90)
BP systolic (mmHg)	103 (94 - 109)	138 (122 - 154)
BP diastolic (mmHg)	56 (53 - 59)	65 (61 - 68)
MAP (mmHg)	70 (66 - 74)	85 (80 - 95)

Abbreviations: AVR aortic valve replacement, BMI body mass index, BP Blood pressure, IBW ideal body weight, CABG coronary artery bypass graft, EtCO₂ End-tidal CO₂, FiO₂ fraction of inspired oxygen, IQR interquartile Range, MAP Mean Arterial Pressure, MVP mitral valve repair, MIC minimal invasive surgery, PEEP positive end-expiratory pressure, PC pressure control, PS Pressure Support, Pplat plateau pressure, Pocc occlusion pressure, RR Respiratory Rate, ROSS procedure aortic valve replacement with own pulmonary valve and pulmonary allograft, SpO₂ oxygen saturation

Table 2 Static comparisons for Pes_{solid} – Pes_{bal} (controlled ventilation)¹

	Expiratory hold	Inspiratory hold	ΔPes
Mean difference (cmH ₂ O)	-0.21	-0.36	-0.15
SD of difference (cmH ₂ O)	0.90	0.77	0.76
Upper LoA (cmH ₂ O)	1.56	1.16	1.33
Lower LoA (cmH ₂ O)	-1.98	-1.87	-1.63

¹Patient 16 was removed from this analysis due to unphysiological inspiratory and delta Pes values.

488 FIGURE LEGENDS

489 **Figure 1.** Bench results over a 120-hour measurement period, for the minimum pressures (A),
490 maximum pressures (B) and delta pressures (C). Black line represents the mean difference (bias, i.e.
491 solid-state catheter pressure (P_{solid}) minus reference pressure (P_{ref})), dashed gray lines are the
492 upper and lower limits of agreement.

493

494 **Figure 2.** Examples of tracings obtained in two different healthy volunteers, during unloaded tidal
495 breathing in supine (A) and sitting (B) position.

496

497 **Figure 3.** Bland-Altman results for healthy volunteers. Each color represents a different subject.

498

499 **Figure 4.** Examples of tracings obtained in four different patients during controlled ventilation (A, B)
500 and assisted ventilation (C, D).


501

502 **Figure 5.** Bland-Altman results for patients on controlled ventilation. Each color represents a
503 different patient.


504

505 **Figure 6.** Bland-Altman results for patients on assisted ventilation. Each color represents a different
506 patient; subject's color coding is similar for Figure 5.


A. Minimum pressures




B. Maximum pressures




C. Delta pressures




A. Example 1: healthy volunteer, tidal breathing in supine position




B. Example 2: healthy volunteer, tidal breathing in sitting position




A. End-expiratory Pes




B. End-inspiratory Pes




C. Δ Pes




A. Example 1: patient, controlled ventilation




B. Example 2: patient, controlled ventilation




C. Example 3: patient, assisted ventilation




D. Example 4: patient, assisted ventilation




A. Controlled: end-expiratory Pes




B. Controlled: end-inspiratory Pes




C. Controlled: ΔPes



A. Assisted: end-expiratory Pes



B. Assisted: end-inspiratory Pes



C. Assisted: Δ Pes

