

1 ***Gaseous micro-embolism (GME) is associated with systemic inflammatory response***
2 ***syndrome (SIRS) after open heart surgery. A missing piece of a complex puzzle?***

3

4 Stefanos Demertzis^{1,2,5*}, Mira Puthettu^{1,3}, Matteo Nafi⁴, Pietro Bagnato¹, Tiziano Cassina^{4,2,6},
5 Stijn Vandenberghe^{1,2,3}

6

7 ¹ Department of Cardiac Surgery, Cardiocentro Ticino Institute, Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale
8 (EOC), Lugano, Switzerland

9

10 ² Faculty of Biomedical Sciences, Università della Svizzera Italiana (USI), Lugano,
11 Switzerland

12

13 ³ Institute of Translational Research, Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale (EOC), Bellinzona,
14 Switzerland

15

16 ⁴ Department of Cardio-Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, Cardiocentro Ticino
17 Institute, Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale (EOC), Lugano, Switzerland

18

19 ⁵ Faculty of Medicine, University of Berne, Berne, Switzerland

20

21 ⁶ Faculty of Medicine, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

22

23

24

25

26 * Corresponding author

27 Email: stefanos.demertzis@eoc.ch / stefanos.demertzis@usi.ch

28

29

30

31

32 **Abstract**

33

34 **Background**

35 Gaseous micro-embolism (GME) occurring during contemporary open heart surgery is poorly
36 studied. Current understanding of the biological impact of cardiac surgery focuses on the
37 surgical aggression itself together with contact activation of inflammatory cascades by the
38 extracorporeal circulation (ECC), both promoting various degrees of a systemic inflammatory
39 response syndrome (SIRS).

40

41 **Methods and Findings**

42 We prospectively collected data on GME in the ECC circuit according to a quality control
43 protocol during a 12-month period at our institution. Bubbles were measured means of a last
44 generation multi-channel ultrasound measuring unit (BCC300, Gampt GmbH, Meerseburg,
45 Germany) upstream of the arterial line filter. For analysis, bubbles were separated in three
46 size categories: small (S) (10-40 μm), medium (M) (41-200 μm) and large (L) (201-2000
47 μm). Small bubbles were considered as noise and excluded. A total of 58 out of 70 open
48 heart procedures were included in the final evaluation performed on 58 patients (45 males, 13
49 females, mean age 66 ± 9 years). Patient baseline data, type of procedure and perfusion data
50 were retrieved. Preoperative treatment with beta-blockers, ACE-inhibitors, calcium-
51 antagonists and statins was considered. Postoperative SIRS was identified according to
52 modified SIRS and qSOFA criteria.

53 A variably high amount of GME was detected (mean count 847 ± 2560), we focused on M-
54 sized GME (mean count 820 ± 2546 , mean volume 233 ± 730 nL). A total of 22 patients
55 (38%) developed SIRS. To account for differences between patient groups (SIRS- / SIRS+)
56 propensity score (PS) matching was performed on the presence of M-bubbles at or above the

57 75th percentile (count and volume). The impact of such GME on the development of SIRS
58 was statistically highly significant, as shown by the corresponding average treatment effects
59 (ATE).

60

61 **Conclusions**

62 Significant GME was associated with postoperative SIRS after cardiac surgery in our setting.

63 This novel finding warrants further confirmation.

64

65

66

67

68 **Introduction**

69 Gaseous micro-embolism (GME) occurring during contemporary open heart surgery is
70 generally poorly studied and understood. Current understanding sees it as a potential cause of
71 postoperative cognitive decline [1], despite the lack of hard evidence of this association such
72 as a correlated neurological imaging.

73 Systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS) can complicate open heart surgery. It
74 manifests with hemodynamic instability due to decreased peripheral vascular resistance (so
75 called vasoplegia), fluid accumulation in the third space and increased inflammatory
76 parameters in the blood. Accurate management in the ICU is required to avoid secondary
77 complications.

78 The use of cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) or extracorporeal circulation (ECC) is thought to
79 be one of the possible causes of SIRS due to activation of non-specific pro-inflammatory
80 cascades. It is described, that despite the presence of arterial filters with a 40 µm mesh size,
81 air bubbles of larger diameters can be detected in high counts in the arterial line after the
82 arterial filter. Air bubbles embolizing in small arteries and/or capillaries can cause harm by
83 two mechanisms: a reduction in perfusion distal to the obstruction and an inflammatory
84 response[2]. We hypothesized therefore, that GME in the arterial line could be associated
85 with the development of systemic inflammatory response (SIRS) after cardiac surgery.

86

87 **Patients and Methods**

88 We prospectively collected data on air-bubble presence in the ECC circuit according to a
89 quality control protocol at our institution. Measurements were carried out during 70
90 consecutive open-heart procedures. The basic circuit design was identical in all procedures
91 prefabricated customized kits composed of PVC tubing (with heat-exchanger for the

92 cardioplegic solution and suction devices), venous reservoir, oxygenator and arterial filter.

93 De-airing was uniform and according to our standard protocols.

94

95 *Bubble measurement*

96 Count and diameter of air bubbles were determined throughout extracorporeal perfusion by

97 means of a last generation multi-channel ultrasound measuring unit (BCC300, Gampt GmbH,

98 Meerseburg, Germany) with sensors placed at three different positions of the extracorporeal

99 circuit. However, for the purpose of this article, measurements are only considered from the

100 probe located directly upstream of the arterial outflow line, thus recording air bubbles going

101 into the patient. The concept and validations of the GAMPT system are described elsewhere

102 [3].

103 Data were extracted from the BCC300 and synchronized by means of a MatLab algorithm

104 with perfusion log data extracted from the heart-lung machine (Stöckert S5, LivaNova PLC,

105 London, UK). Clinical data were retrieved from the electronic patient record. Data were

106 merged into a spreadsheet table and subsequently anonymized.

107

108 *Ethics*

109 All patients signed an informed consent for the use of health-related data for scientific

110 purposes. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and was

111 approved by the Cantonal Ethics Committee (CE TI 4029).

112

113

114 *Bubble data*

115 The measuring range of the bubble counter is 10-2000 μm , while rare overrange bubbles are

116 also counted without dimensional info. Bubble volume is derived automatically by the bubble

117 counter and calculated from the diameters, while also tracking the total accumulated air
118 volume. Data is recorded every second and can be exported as histogram with 10 μ m bins and
119 as a time line of detected counts and volumes. For analysis, bubbles were separated in three
120 size categories: small-(S) (10-40 μ m), medium-(M) (41-200 μ m) and large-(L) (201-2000
121 μ m). Small bubbles were excluded and considered as noise.

122

123 *Clinical data*

124 Patient baseline data (age, sex), as well as type of procedure (coronary artery bypass grafting
125 (CABG) or valve / aortic), and perfusion data (perfusion- and cross-clamp time) were
126 retrieved. In addition, preoperative treatment with beta-blocker, ACE-inhibitors, calcium-
127 antagonists and statins was identified. For the postoperative period, routinely measured
128 inflammatory parameters (C-reactive protein (CRP), leucocytes) were retrieved and
129 vasoactive intravenous medication was reviewed to identify maximum dose and duration of
130 noradrenaline-infusion, as well, as the perceived need and administration of steroid boluses
131 and / or vasopressin-infusion.

132

133 *Definition of SIRS*

134 We defined SIRS according to two frequently used scores SIRS and qSOFA[4] after adapting
135 them to address the initial period after cardiac surgery (intubated and sedated patient).

136 We confirmed SIRS when two or more of the following criteria were met:

137

- 138 1. CRP at 0 - 24 - 48 hours upon arrival in ICU in doubling increase
- 139 2. Leucocyte count at 24 hours > 12000 / μ l (as in SIRS scoring)
- 140 3. Noradrenaline peak dose > 6 μ g/kg/min and / or need of Noradrenaline for >12 h (as
141 surrogate of qSOFA criterion “systolic blood pressure <100”)

142 4. Administration of steroid bolus and / or vasopressin (as a further surrogate of qSOFA
143 criterion “systolic blood pressure <100”)

144

145 Two independent blinded raters assigned the SIRS positive / negative / doubt status. Cases of
146 doubt or of discrepant assigned status were discussed and analyzed in a consensus round.
147 Where needed, more elements (such as temperature, liquid balance) were retrieved from the
148 electronic patient record and a consensus was achieved.

149

150 *Statistical analysis*

151 Surgical procedures were classified as CABG only or procedure with opening of the heart
152 chambers (“other”, with or without CABG). This categorical variable was introduced to capture
153 a potentially different bubble-load between these types of operations. New categorical
154 variables were created to identify bubble load at or above the 75th percentile of total count
155 and total volume, respectively. Another categorical variable identified patients with SIRS.
156 Differences between groups were assessed with the Student’s t-test (normally distributed
157 continuous variables) or with the Wilcoxon rank-sum test (categorical variables) as appropriate.
158 To account for differences between the groups and for potential confounding we applied a
159 propensity score (PS) matching procedure. The propensity of measuring bubble values at and
160 above the 75th percentile was calculated by means of logit regression analysis including all
161 available pre-treatment variables. Patients were matched according to the predicted
162 propensity score (1:1 match). Finally, the average treatment effect (ATE) of the matched
163 cohort on the development of SIRS was calculated. To quantify the robustness of the
164 obtained ATE, a sensitivity analysis was performed using the Stata package
165 “tesensitivity”[5]. Significance level was set at $p < 0.05$. All statistical analysis was performed
166 with STATA (version 17.0, StataCrp LLC, College Station, Texas, USA).

167

168

169

170 **Results**

171 A total of 58 patients were included in the final analysis, operated upon from September 2020
172 to August 2021. Out of the 70 measured open-heart procedures, 5 patients were excluded
173 because they entered surgery with an already activated inflammatory status (2 patients with
174 acute / subacute endocarditis, 2 patients with mechanical complications of acute / subacute
175 myocardial infarction, 1 patient with an inflammatory reaction of unknown origin). The
176 residual 7 excluded patients were not considered due to incomplete measurements or clearly
177 demonstrated electrical interferences in the BCC300 recordings. A total of 22 patients (38%)
178 developed SIRS, no patient developed clinically evident neurological symptoms or stroke, all
179 patients survived. Clinical characteristics of the included 58 patients are summarized in Table
180 1.

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195 Table 1: Clinical patient characteristics of the group that did not develop SIRS (SIRS-; n=36)
 196 and the group that developed SIRS (SIRS+; n=22) before PS-matching (*: statistically
 197 significant differences, SD: standard deviation)
 198

	SIRS-		SIRS+		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	<i>p</i> -value
Age (years)	65.8	9.1	66.4	9.6	0.802
BMI	29.6	23.5	28.1	5.1	0.764
ES II (%)	1.7	1.9	2.3	2.2	0.287
Target ECC					
flow (l/min)	4.5	0.45	4.7	0.38	0.169
ECC time (min)	114	35	140	72	0.07
X-clamp time					
(min)	77	28	102	47	0.012*
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	<i>p</i> -value
Sex	m: 27 / f: 9	75 / 25	m: 18 / f: 4	82 / 18	0.549
Type of surgery					
(CABG/other)	13 / 23	36 / 64	6 / 16	27 / 73	0.49
Statins					
(Y/N)	26	72	9	40	0.019*
Beta-blockers					
(Y/N)	17	48	13	59	0.384
ACE-inhibitors					
(Y/N)	13	47	14	63	0.043*
Ca-blockers					
(Y/N)	9	28	5	22	0.391

199

200

201 The types of the performed surgical procedures are summarized in Table 2.

202

203

204

205 Table 2: Types of performed surgical procedures (n = 58).

Type of surgery	SIRS-		SIRS+		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
CABG	13	36	5	23	18	31
CABG & valve(s)	4	11	6	27	10	17
Valve(s)	17	47	10	10	27	47
Valve(s) & aortic	2	6	1	1	3	5

206

207

208 Total count and volume of air bubbles was highly variable and with some outliers. Mean total
209 count (S-bubbles (<40 μ m of diameter) excluded) was 847 ± 25560 , mean total volume $233 \pm$
210 730 nL.

211

212 An overview of the distribution of total, medium-sized (M) and large-sized (L) bubble counts
213 is shown in Figure 1.

214

215

216 Fig. 1: Violin plots (kernel density method) showing the frequency distribution of the
217 measured bubbles A. Counts of all included open-heart procedures, B & C. Counts in patients
218 without and with SIRS in the postoperative period (the dashed lines within the violin
219 represent the median, the dotted ones the quartiles). In A and B the choice of the Y-axis
220 truncated for graphical reasons 4 patients with outlier counts for M-bubbles of respectively:
221 6008, 6931, 7537 and 16099, which are all included in the analysis. Individual graphs were
222 produced with GraphPad Prism version 9 for Mac, GraphPad Software, San Diego, California
223 USA, www.graphpad.com.

224

225

226 Our analysis focused on the M-sized bubbles due to the high proportion of outliers in the L-
227 sized group. The average values for count and volume for the M-sized bubbles are presented

228 in Table 3. Distribution of the values was not normal, therefore statistical comparison was
 229 performed with the Wilcoxon rank-sum test. Patients, who developed SIRS had significantly
 230 higher counts and volume of M-sized air bubbles.

231

232 Table 3: Values for count and volume of the M-medium sized bubbles, overall and divided by
 233 groups (*: statistical significance between patient groups).

234

Count bubbles	M-sized					75th percentile	<i>p</i> -value
	Mean	SE	95% CI				
Overall	819.51	334.37	149.94	1480.09	232.00	0.025*	
SIRS-	176.22	57.43	61.20	291.23	144.50		
SIRS +	1872.18	840.28	189.56	3554.81	771.00		

Volume bubbles	M-sized					75th percentile	<i>p</i> -value
	Mean	SE	95% CI				
Overall	233.10	95.86	41.14	426.06	90.00	0.018*	
SIRS-	40.92	9.02	22.84	58.99	54.50		
SIRS +	547.59	240.72	65.55	1029.64	138.00		

235

236

237 The categorical variables “CountM_p75” and “VoumeM_p75” were created to depict patients
 238 with counts and volume of M-sized bubbles at or above the 75th percentile of the respective
 239 distribution. Two PS-matching procedures were performed with distinct “treatment” defined
 240 by each one of these variables. The resulting “control” and “treated” groups are shown in
 241 Table 4.

242

243

244

245 Table 4: Pre-treatment variables in the “control” and “treated” groups after PS-matching,
246 demonstrating balanced variables between the groups

247

PS-match on variable "CountM_p75"

	Control	Treated	p-value
Age	66.3	65.2	0.842
Sex	0.77	0.8	0.612
BMI	28.7	29.9	0.758
ES II	1.79	2.22	0.493
Type of OP	0.30	0.4	0.327
Statins	0.56	0.73	0.177
Beta-blockers	0.49	0.6	0.552
ACE-inhibitors	0.40	0.6	0.218
Ca-antagonists	0.39	0.41	0.816

PS-match on variable "VolumeM_p75"

	Control	Treated	p-value
Age	66.7	64	0.155
Sex	0.81	0.64	0.641
BMI	28.7	30.6	0.511
ES II	1.81	2.17	0.493
Type of OP	0.34	0.27	0.327
Statins	0.6	0.6	0.784
Beta-blockers	0.51	0.53	0.477
ACE-inhibitors	0.44	0.53	0.467
Ca-antagonists	0.39	0.41	0.619

248

249

250 The computed average treatment effects (ATEs) were statistically highly significant,
251 indicating that “treatment” characterized by these two variables (high count or volume of
252 mid-sized bubbles) caused more frequently SIRS: for the variable “CountM_p75” the
253 coefficient was 0.6 ($p < 0.011$, 95% CI: 0.46 – 0.75) and for the variable “VolumeM_p75” the
254 coefficient was 0.53 ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI 0.29 – 0.64). The sensitivity analysis showed
255 moderately robust bounds for the estimated ATEs (for “CountM_p75” breakdown at a scalar
256 sensitivity parameter $c = 0.136$, 6 iterations and for “VolumeM_p75” breakdown at $c =$
257 0.215, 10 iterations).

258

259

260 **Discussion**

261 The reported findings show a statistically significant association of higher amounts of mid-
262 sized GME with the development of SIRS after open heart surgery in our setting and thus
263 support the hypothesis of a negative impact of GME on clinical outcomes. The latter might
264 appear obvious, however, solid evidence is still lacking. Therefore, we consider our findings
265 significant, despite the evident limitations of our study: results are from a single center,
266 observational and retrospective study initiated after the evidence of significant amounts of
267 micro-bubbles passing through the bubble-filters and therefore with limited generalizability
268 and lack of control of unknown confounders (known confounders were controlled by means
269 of propensity score matching).

270 Cardiac surgery and the use of ECC are known to induce a systemic inflammatory reaction.

271 The term “systemic inflammatory response syndrome” (SIRS) describes an intense
272 nonspecific, generalized inflammatory process, which despite some overlaps goes beyond
273 normal postoperative physiology [6]. Morbidity and mortality are increased in patients
274 developing SIRS after cardiac surgery [7]. The prevalence of SIRS after cardiac surgery

275 varies according to the criteria defined for its diagnosis and is reported between 12% and
276 59% [7,8]. In our setting, prevalence was 38%.

277 There is an acknowledged issue in identifying SIRS after open heart surgery [7]: patients are
278 admitted to the ICU intubated, ventilated and sedated, having been exposed to ECC, which is
279 unique to this patient population and is generally considered a causative factor for fast-onset
280 postoperative SIRS. This constellation challenges the typical definition criteria for SIRS [4,9]
281 and might cause selection bias due to misclassification. We adopted the two major collections
282 of definition criteria (SIRS and qSOFA) and adapted them to the specific setting of the
283 immediate and early postoperative period after open heart surgery. Differences in assigning a
284 distinct SIRS status emerged between the two blinded raters in borderline patients. A
285 thorough review of each disputed individual record was done to achieve a consensus. Some
286 pharmacological compounds frequently prescribed in patients with heart disease aimed
287 towards reduction of cardiac afterload, could potentially interfere with postoperative vascular
288 resistance, peripheral tissue perfusion and volume shifts. Therefore, we included presence of
289 such drugs (β -blockers, ACE-inhibitors, calcium antagonists) as potential confounders for the
290 need of postoperative vasopressor support in the calculations to build the propensity score in
291 our analysis.

292

293 Direct contact activation of a non-specific immune reaction following interaction of
294 leucocytes, endothelial cells and foreign surface of the ECC circuit, ischemia-reperfusion
295 injury of the endothelium in general and of specific organs (myocardium, lungs, brain,
296 kidneys) and finally endotoxemia due to splanchnic hypoperfusion and bacterial translocation
297 are suggested as possible causes [8]. In any case the subsequent pathophysiological processes
298 seem to be common to all three mentioned possible causes. Activation of several
299 inflammatory cascades occurs (complement-, kallikrein-, cytokine-, activated-neutrophil-,

300 nitric-oxide-, coagulation- and fibrinolytic systems) together with cellular immune response,
301 most of them vigorously interacting with each other [6,10]. Interestingly, almost all attempts
302 to control these mechanisms either pharmacologically or by optimizing the biocompatibility
303 of the ECC circuits were not as successful as initially hoped in tempering the systemic
304 inflammatory response in a measure to influence clinical outcomes [11–14][12–15].

305 A neglected aspect of open-heart surgery is gas micro-embolism (GME), especially in the
306 contemporary era of modern extracorporeal equipment with adequate bubble filtering.

307 The main part of this work, i.e. detection and measurement of GME using the last version of
308 a specifically developed accurate ultrasonic bubble counter [16,17], was primarily conceived
309 as a quality control study on the basis of similar evidence in the past [18]. The potential
310 association of GME with SIRS after cardiac surgery emerged during internal brainstorming
311 aimed to understand the significance of our findings. We could confirm GME of variable
312 characteristics in all controlled open-heart operations despite all currently available
313 precautions [19][3]. Interestingly enough, we identified a substantial fraction of mainly mid-
314 sized but also large bubbles (40 - 200 μ m and 201 - 2000 μ m of diameter, respectively),
315 dimensions well beyond the mesh size of the arterial filters (40 μ m). Is the presence of these
316 micro-bubbles due to an intrinsic failure of the arterial filters, due to shape deformation of the
317 passing bubbles, or do bubbles break down and re-aggregate to bigger ones after passing the
318 filter? Specific laboratory studies could shed light into this phenomenon.

319

320 Arterial gas embolism even only with micro-bubbles can cause tissue ischemia and provoke
321 an inflammatory response [19,20]. In our PS-matched group of patients we were able to
322 identify a significant effect of GME on the occurrence of SIRS after open heart surgery. We
323 were able to detect statistically significant effects when focusing on the higher counts and
324 more specifically of the M-sized GME (41-200 μ m in diameter). We believe, this finding

325 makes sense from a biological perspective. Only higher quantities of embolizing M-sized
326 microbubbles are probably sufficient enough to significantly activate or amplify the
327 inflammatory processes without causing clinically detectable tissue ischemia. The systemic
328 impact of GME could be explained by the additive effect of many diffuse local inflammatory
329 reactions caused or amplified by the high counts of clouds of bubbles. This association of
330 GME with postoperative SIRS is not described in literature and warrants further confirmation
331 studies. Significant GME could be indeed the missing element in the complex mechanisms
332 leading to SIRS after open heart surgery.

333

334 Acknowledging the limitations of our work, we believe our findings point towards a new
335 mechanism of SIRS after cardiac surgery and we see them as a founded basis to generate
336 hypotheses for future prospective studies. In any case, further analyses are underway to
337 identify possible remedies to reduce GME in our ECC circuits and thereby potentially reduce
338 its negative biological impact on our patients.

339

340 *Acknowledgments*

341 The precious support of the teams of cardiac surgeons, perfusionists, anesthesiologists,
342 intensivists and the ICU nursing staff of our institute is deeply and thankfully acknowledged.

343 This study was partially funded by grant FF 20134 from the Swiss Heart Foundation.

344 **References**

345

346 1. Groom RC, Quinn RD, Lennon P, Donegan DJ, Braxton JH, Kramer RS, et al. Detection
347 and Elimination of Microemboli Related to Cardiopulmonary Bypass. *Circulation Cardiovasc*
348 *Qual Outcomes*. 2009;2(3):191–8.

349 2. Moon RE. Gas embolism. In: Whelan HT, editor. *Hyperbaric Medicine Practice*, 4th
350 edition. North Palm Beach, FL, USA: Best Publishing Company; 2016. p. 359–76.

351 3. Segers T, Stehouwer MC, Somer FMJJ de, Mol BA de, Versluis M. Optical verification
352 and in-vitro characterization of two commercially available acoustic bubble counters for
353 cardiopulmonary bypass systems. *Perfusion*. 2018;33(1):16–24.

354 4. Singer M, Deutschman CS, Seymour CW, Shankar-Hari M, Annane D, Bauer M, et al. The
355 Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3). *Jama*.
356 2016;315(8):801–10.

357 5. Masten M, Poirier A. *tesensitivity: A Stata Package for Assessing the Unconfoundedness*
358 *Assumption* [Internet]. Chicago, IL, USA: Stata Corporation; 2019 Jul. Available from:
359 <https://ideas.repec.org/p/boc/scon19/51.html>

360 6. Warltier DC, Laffey JG, Boylan JF, Cheng DCH. The Systemic Inflammatory Response to
361 Cardiac Surgery. *Anesthesiology*. 2002;97(1):215–52.

362 7. MacCallum NS, Finney SJ, Gordon SE, Quinlan GJ, Evans TW. Modified Criteria for the
363 Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome Improves Their Utility Following Cardiac
364 Surgery. *Chest*. 2014;145(6):1197–203.

- 365 8. Squicciarro E, Labriola C, Malvindi PG, Margari V, Guida P, Visicchio G, et al.
366 Prevalence and Clinical Impact of Systemic Inflammatory Reaction After Cardiac Surgery. *J*
367 *Cardiothor Vasc An.* 2019;33(6):1682–90.
- 368 9. Dellinger RP, Levy MM, Carlet JM, Bion J, Parker MM, Jaeschke R, et al. Surviving
369 Sepsis Campaign: International guidelines for management of severe sepsis and septic shock.
370 *Crit Care Med.* 2008;36(1):296–327.
- 371 10. Kirklin JK. Prospects for understanding and eliminating the deleterious effects of
372 cardiopulmonary bypass. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 1991;51(4):529–31.
- 373 11. Dieleman JM, Nierich AP, Rosseel PM, Maaten JM van der, Hofland J, Diephuis JC, et
374 al. Intraoperative High-Dose Dexamethasone for Cardiac Surgery: A Randomized Controlled
375 Trial. *Jama.* 2012;308(17):1761–7.
- 376 12. Gu YJ, Oeveren W van, Akkerman C, Boonstra PW, Huyzen RJ, Wildevuur CRH.
377 Heparin-coated circuits reduce the inflammatory response to cardiopulmonary bypass. *Ann*
378 *Thorac Surg.* 1993;55(4):917–22.
- 379 13. Whitlock RP, Devereaux PJ, Teoh KH, Lamy A, Vincent J, Pogue J, et al.
380 Methylprednisolone in patients undergoing cardiopulmonary bypass (SIRS): a randomised,
381 double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet.* 2015;386(10000):1243–53.
- 382 14. Verrier ED, Shernan SK, Taylor KM, Werf FV de, Newman MF, Chen JC, et al.
383 Terminal Complement Blockade With Pexelizumab During Coronary Artery Bypass Graft
384 Surgery Requiring Cardiopulmonary Bypass: A Randomized Trial. *Jama.*
385 2004;291(19):2319–27.

- 386 15. Ranucci M, Baryshnikova E. Inflammation and coagulation following minimally invasive
387 extracorporeal circulation technologies. *J Thorac Dis.* 2019;1(1):S1480–8.
- 388 16. Wallen TE, Singer KE, Morris MC, Blakeman T, Stevens-Topie SM, Strilka R, et al.
389 Blood product resuscitation mitigates the effects of aeromedical evacuation after polytrauma.
390 *J Trauma Acute Care.* 2022;92(1):12–20.
- 391 17. Woods CE, Viswanathan R, Reddy V. Electrolytic Effects from a Clinical Endocardial
392 Pulsed Field Ablation System in a Benchtop Model: a Comparison of Gas Formation with
393 Focal RF Ablation (AFS 2021 □42). *J Cardiovasc Electr.* 2021;32(5):1467–515.
- 394 18. Lynch JE, Wells C, Akers T, Frantz P, Garrett D, Scott ML, et al. Monitoring
395 microemboli during cardiopulmonary bypass with the EDAC quantifier. *J Extra-corporeal*
396 *Technology [Internet].* 2010;42(3):212–8. Available from:
397 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4679961/>
- 398 19. Muth CM, Shank ES. Gas Embolism. *New Engl J Medicine.* 2000;342(7):476–82.
- 399 20. Kapoor T, Gutierrez G. Air embolism as a cause of the systemic inflammatory response
400 syndrome: a case report. *Crit Care.* 2003;7(5):R98–100.

401

