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 Oosten ¹ , Nico Goedendorp ¹ , Amne Mousa ^{2,3} , Rutger Flink ⁴ , Rik Schaart ⁴ ,					
5	Merel Flinsenberg ¹ , Peter Somhorst ¹ , Diederik A.M.P.J. Gommers ¹ , Leo Heunks ⁵ ,					
6	Annemijn H. Jonkman ¹					
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: <u>j.vanoosten@erasmusmc.nl</u> ;					
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

Background: Advanced respiratory monitoring through the measurement of esophageal pressure (Pes) as a surrogate of pleural pressure helps guiding mechanical ventilation in ICU patients. Pes measurement with an esophageal balloon catheter, the current clinical reference standard, needs complex calibrations and a multitude of factors influence its 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 ($P_{solid} - P_{ref}$) 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 ΔPes 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] cmH_2O for end-expiratory, end-inspiratory and
51	ΔPes values, respectively. LoA were <2cmH ₂ O 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
55 56	in healthy volunteers and in ventilated ICU-patients. This could contribute to the implementation of Pes as advanced respiratory monitoring technique.
55 56 57	in healthy volunteers and in ventilated ICU-patients. This could contribute to the implementation of Pes as advanced respiratory monitoring technique.

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, adequate balloon position and filling volume should be regularly confirmed with an 73 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 <u>METHODS</u>

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*

We recruited healthy, non-obese adults without history of cardiac and/or pulmonary disease and contraindications for nasogastric catheter placement (e.g., esophageal varices, 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**

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

119

120 **Esophageal manometry**

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

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

connected to an acquisition system (MP160, BIOPAC Systems Inc., USA) for simultaneous
 recording of waveforms sampled at 200Hz. Waveforms were synchronized with the solid 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 <u>Catheter placement/calibration</u>

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 Pes 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 $\Delta Pes_{bal}/\Delta Paw$ 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 <u>Measurements</u>

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 <u>Catheter placement/calibration</u>

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 <u>Measurements</u>

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

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

182

183 **Offline analysis**

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

188 For the healthy volunteers and patient studies, signal processing and analyses were performed in MATLAB (Mathworks, USA). Periods or individual breaths with substantial 189 190 artifacts (e.g., esophageal spasms, coughing) were removed. Signals were processed using a 2^{nd} -order 5 Hz low-pass Butterworth filter followed by a 0.1 second unweighted moving 191 192 average filter. Static measurements for end-expiratory and end-inspiratory holds (in 193 patients) and the Baydur maneuver ($\Delta Pes_{bal}/\Delta Paw$ and $\Delta Pes_{solid}/\Delta Paw$) were manually 194 selected from the tracings. Whereas the $\Delta Pes_{bal}/\Delta Paw$ 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 Pes, end-expiratory Pes and the resulting inspiratory amplitude (ΔPes) were computed 199 breath-by-breath for both signals (in cmH₂O).

200

201 Endpoints

For the bench study, P_{solid} was compared to P_{ref} . For healthy subjects and patients, the primary endpoint was the difference in absolute Pes values between the solid-state sensor and balloon catheter (Pes_{solid} - Pes_{bal}), measured at end-expiration and peak inspiration, and the difference in relative Pes values (i.e., inspiratory amplitude) between both catheters (ΔPes_{solid} - ΔPes_{bal}). Endpoints were separated for the different ventilation modes/populations. Secondary endpoints were the stability of the solid-state catheter as 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 and type-II error of 0.20, and the following variables: expected mean (SD) of difference: 0.79 215 216 (0.53) cmH₂O; maximum allowed difference between methods: 3.5 cmH₂O, 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

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

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

232

233 RESULTS

234 Bench study

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

240

241 Healthy volunteers

Fifteen healthy subjects (male/female 3/12; age 35.5 \pm 13.5 years) completed the study without adverse events. Two subjects were excluded from the full analysis, because of balloon catheter dislocation early in the study and inability to obtain reliable recordings after this was noticed (n=1), or balloon Baydur ($\Delta Pes_{bal}/\Delta Paw$) exceeding the 0.8-1.2 range throughout the study (n=1). For other subjects (n=5), short sections with low signal quality were removed (i.e., many esophageal spasms and/or cardiac artefacts, or $\Delta Pes_{bal}/\Delta Paw$ not 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 ₂ O 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 hips and LoA

within the 0.8-1.2 range, 877 breaths were included, resulting in comparable bias and LoA (Additional File 7); 2) when selecting only tracings with both $\Delta Pes_{solid}/\Delta Paw$ and $\Delta Pes_{bal}/\Delta Paw$ ratios between 0.9-1.1 and excluding one subject where cardiac artifacts amplitudes exceeded 5 cmH₂O in both signals, 357 breaths from 11 subjects were used, resulting in a lower bias [upper LoA; lower LoA]: 0.68 [7.80; -6.44], -2.08 [3.21; -7.37] and 2.77 [9.42; -3.89] cmH₂O 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 Pesbal tracings were adequately calibrated with a Baydur maneuver between 286 0.9-1.1. No adverse events were reported.

287

288 Signal interference

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

293

294 Comparisons

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

297	$Pes_{solid} - Pes_{bal}$) [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] cmH ₂ O for end-expiratory, end-inspiratory and ΔPes values, respectively.
299	Patient 16 demonstrated inspiratory pressure amplifications in Pessolid 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] cmH ₂ O for end-expiratory, end-inspiratory and ΔPes values, respectively.

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

During assisted ventilation, bias remained low, but LoAs were wider, yet smaller than in healthy volunteers (Figure 6): -0.20 [5.02; -5.41], -0.54 [4.60; -5.68] and 0.35 [3.88; -3.18] cmH_2O for end-expiratory, end-inspiratory and ΔPes values, respectively.

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

312

313 DISCUSSION

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

ventilation) and further in static conditions (breath holds); 4) the sensor remained stable throughout study recordings; 5) the solid-state Pes catheter often measured higher Δ Pes 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 $5.1 \text{ cmH}_2\text{O}$ (range: 0.8 to $35.1 \text{ cmH}_2\text{O}$) 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 $(\Delta Pes_{bal}/\Delta Paw$ 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 Δ Pes value, which may impact clinical decision-making when applying Pes-based ventilation strategies. 342 343 Considering the solid-state sensor stability, represented by the excellent offline obtained

ΔPes_{solid}/ΔPaw (1.01±0.14 in healthy volunteers, 1.05±0.18 in patients) and bench results, it
can also be argued that the solid-state sensor better represented the actual (delta) Pes.
Studies comparing different Pes sensor types (i.e., solid-state, balloons [11], liquid-filled
catheters) are therefore challenging to interpret without the clinical availability of a true
reference standard.

349

350 Related works

351 Over 20 years ago, solid-state Pes catheters were compared with a balloon catheter in healthy volunteers[6,8] demonstrating reliable relative/delta Pes values. However, 352 353 uncontrollable offset shifts (10 cmH₂O for transpulmonary pressure[6]) and a high bias (>7 354 $cmH_2O[8]$) 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 delta 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 Pesbal 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 Pessolid were sometimes high and body

position dependent (e.g., more marked in supine position, see Additional file 11, in line with[8]), and more negative Pes values were observed with larger inspiratory efforts (Figure 2). This warrants careful identification and interpretation of artifacts, improved signal filtering at the bedside, and/or optimizing the sensor positioning. The smaller biases and LoA in ICU patients as compared to healthy volunteers could be explained by the stable ventilator settings and the low variability in breathing efforts during assisted mode. In 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 Pesbal tracings. Nevertheless, when selecting stable tracings where the 389 balloon was properly calibrated, good agreement between Pesbal and Pessolid 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

end-expiratory Pes values, likely the result of inspiratory effort maneuvers and/or cardiac
artifacts. In addition, two patients demonstrated unphysiologically high Pes_{solid} values (see
Results) despite proper calibration, reposition attempts and verification of esophageal
positioning. Last, we did not perform multiple-day testing of the solid-state catheter in the
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.

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

415 <u>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</u>

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

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,
449 450	AM, RF, MF, LH, AHJ; Data interpretation: all authors; Manuscript drafting: JPVO, NG, AHJ;
451	Supervision. En, Aris, Manuscript revising for intellectual content and iniar approval, all authors.

452 Acknowledgements

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

454	REFERE	NCES_
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. <i>Eur Respir Rev</i> 2023; 32:
457		220186
458	2.	Talmor D, Sarge T, Malhotra A, et al. Mechanical ventilation guided by esophageal pressure
459		i n 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		<i>Care.</i> 2014;20(1):39-46.
465	5.	Mojoli F, lotti 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 Anestesiol 2015;81: 855-64
482		
483		
484		
485		
486		

487 <u>TABLES</u>

Table I Main characteristics of the study populatic	Table 1 Main	characteristics	of the	study	populatio
--	--------------	-----------------	--------	-------	-----------

Characteristic	Total <i>(N = 16)</i>		
Age, years; median (IQR)	65 (58 - 69)		
Male, sex; n (%)	15 (5	94)	
BMI kg/m²; 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	Assisted ventilation	
	(median (IQR))	(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		
¹ Detient 1C was several data as this analysis due to unphysic leaving increases and delta Desuglues					

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

488 FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Bench results over a 120-hour measurement period, for the minimum pressures (A),
maximum pressures (B) and delta pressures (C). Black line represents the mean difference (bias, i.e.
solid-state catheter pressure (Psolid) minus reference pressure (Pref)), dashed gray lines are the
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).

- 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



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



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







