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ABSTRACT
A pandemic caused by the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 was declared in 2020. Severe cases were characterized by the development of acute hypoxemic respiratory failure (AHRF) requiring advanced respiratory support. However, intensive care units (ICU) were saturated, and many patients had to be treated out of ICU. This case describes a 75-year-old man affected by AHRF due to Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19), hospitalized in a high-dependency unit, with PaO$_2$/FiO$_2$ <100 for 28 consecutive days. An experienced team with respiratory physiotherapists was in charge of the noninvasive ventilatory support (NIVS). The patient required permanent NIVS with continuous positive airway pressure, non-invasive ventilation, high flow nasal oxygen and body positioning. He was weaned from NIVS after 37 days and started exercise training afterwards. The patient was discharged at home with low-flow oxygen therapy. This case represents an example of a successful treatment of AHRF with the still controversial noninvasive respiratory support in one patient with COVID-19.

Introduction
A pandemic caused by the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) was declared in 2020. Italian health care system was close to collapse due to a high number of patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) acute hypoxemic respiratory failure (AHRF) and acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) requiring advanced respiratory support. However, intensive care units (ICU) were saturated and many patients had to be managed out of ICU [1]. High dependency Units (HDU) have been fully dedicated from that moment on to perform non-invasive ventilation (NIV) in patients with COVID-19 and AHRF. NIV has been used in patients with ARDS, however this therapy is still controversial due to potential delay of intubation and increased mortality rate [2]. The Lung Safe Study showed that NIV was associated with elevated mortality when PaO$_2$/FiO$_2$ was <150 mmHg [3]. Also, an elevated respiratory drive with high tidal volumes (Vt) may cause patient self-inflicted lung injury (P-SILI) worsening pulmonary edema [4]. Moreover, requirement for prolonged NIV sessions for several weeks may be associated with poor tolerance, leading to failure in 5–25% of the cases [5]. Little is known about NIV in patients with COVID-19 and without clear conclusions on the type of patients to be included [6]. However, a non-invasive ventilatory support (NIVS) and body positioning may be the only resource available in some patients affected by AHRF due to COVID-19 and not eligible for
invasive mechanical ventilation, due to the unprecedented and sustained high levels of demand for limited intensive care units capacity [7].

We present a patient affected by severe AHRF due to COVID-19, treated outside the ICU with a prolonged combined strategy of body positioning and alternation of continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP), NIV and High Flow Nasal Oxygen (HFNO), in addition to conventional therapy.

Case report
On April 08/2020, a 75-year-old male with a past medical history of hypokinetic dilated cardiomyopathy (left ventricular ejection fraction 29%), atrial fibrillation, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and body mass index equals to 35.29 kg/m²), with implantable cardioverter-defibrillator was admitted to the Emergency Department (ED) of Niguarda Hospital, Milan (Italy). At admission, the patient presented fever, dyspnea and clinical signs of respiratory distress: respiratory rate (RR) 30 breaths/min, oxygen saturation (SpO₂) 91% with 6 lt/min oxygen. Arterial blood gas analysis (ABG) confirmed severe hypoxemia (pH=7.42; PaO₂=63 mmHg; PaCO₂=33 mmHg) yielding a PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio of 160. Chest computed tomography showed bilateral ground-glass lung changes. The test for COVID-19 was confirmed the same day.

In ED, a Helmet CPAP 10 cmH₂O and FiO₂ 50% was initiated. Few hours later, it was increased to 12.5 cmH₂O and FiO₂ 70%, to maintain a target SpO₂ of 92-94% and PaO₂/FiO₂ around 90. Due to the worsening of oxygenation, the ICU team was immediately notified. However, given the impaired functional status due to multiple comorbidities and low chance to successfully overcome critical illness, the patient was transferred to a COVID-19 HDU dedicated to NIVS with trained physicians, nurses and respiratory physiotherapists (RPTs). A protocol to improve parenchymal recruitment and maximize gas exchange was applied. RPTs implemented Helmet CPAP and changes of body position (prone, right and left and seated position out of bed) every 2-3 hours. All changes of position improved SpO₂ in comparison to supine position. Lateral positions were prevalent during sleep to reduce the respiratory workload due to obesity and prevent possible unrecognized obstructive sleep disorders. Specifically, prone position produced the highest SpO₂ improvement of around 8% being well tolerated by the patient for at least 2 hours. However, oxygenation returned to baseline after re-supination. Despite the severe condition, sitting position was reached almost on a daily basis, and it was associated with a SpO₂ increase of 5-6%.

For the first 8 days the patient remained on similar CPAP and FiO₂ setting for 20-24 hours/day with a mean SpO₂ 92% and RR 27-30 breaths/min (table 1). There was only an adverse event on day 6th.
Suddenly, in an attempt to reach prone position, SpO₂ dropped to 75%, RR > 35 breaths/min and respiratory mechanics deteriorated, even increasing FiO₂ to 100%. Thus, considering the respiratory instability of the patient, prone position was avoided from that moment on.

On day 8th, the patient exhibited intolerance to the helmet, complaining of discomfort and noisiness. An oronasal mask (Mirage 4 Fx NV, Resmed) was introduced during the daytime. Also, HFNO with flow rate of 50 l/min and FiO₂ 80-100% was used to allow short interruptions of CPAP.

The night between the 8th and 9th day, the patient's respiratory function suddenly worsened. He complained of severe dyspnea with paradoxical abdominal breathing, use of respiratory accessory muscles, RR > 40 breaths/min, HR 150/min and SpO₂ between 75 and 80% despite CPAP 12.5 cmH₂O and FiO₂ 100%. Immediately, the patient was switched from CPAP to NIV (Monnal T75, Air Liquide Medical Systems) with pressure support ventilation (PSV) by oronasal mask under the following settings: pressure support (PS) 12 cmH₂O, positive end expiratory pressure (PEEP) 12 cmH₂O, rise time 100 mms and FiO₂ 100%. After 30 minutes the patient showed a reduction of RR to 26-28 breaths/min and SpO₂ stabilized at 95%, with mean Vt equals to 800 ml.

On day 10th, ABG on NIV with FiO₂ 70% showed pH 7.45, PaO₂ 60.6 mmHg and PaCO₂ 43 mmHg. Until day 20th, the patient continued on NIV 24 hours/day with short interruptions of HFNO 60 l/min with FiO₂ 100% for feeding, unless SpO₂ dropped to 85%. Ventilatory setting were able to maintain a mean SpO₂ 90-95% and RR 22-30 breaths/min (table 1).

Due to the permanent mask use, a skin lesion on the nose bridge occurred on day 16th. On that day, ABG showed pH 7.43, PaO₂ 68 mmHg, PaCO₂ 41 mmHg (PaO₂/FiO₂ of 75). To avoid NIV failure, RPTs started rotating different types of masks (Total Face, Respironics; Oronasal, Mirage Ultra and Mirage 4 Fx, Resmed) in order to change the contact points over the skin. After 3 days, the lesion improved, and no more sores appeared.

From day 20th to day 28th severe AHRF persisted while NIV was used 18 hours/day and HFNO for 2 hours, 3 times a day. Changes of PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio and hours per day on each ventilator support are reported in Figure 1.

While on NIV, the patient alternated phases of good tolerance with acceptable breathing pattern in contrast with others of high agitation, severe dyspnea, RR > 30 and increased Vt over 1000 ml, surpassing 8ml/kg/predicted body weight (PBW). In order to reduce inspiratory effort during agitation, first, RPTs increased PS; however, no Vt reduction was observed. Consecutively, PEEP was increased to 15 cmH₂O and support of sedative drug therapy (morphine) was implemented with a reduction of RR below 30 breaths/min, mean Vt around 650 ml and SpO₂ stabilized at 93-94%.
From 29th to 36th day, clinical and respiratory conditions improved, PaO$_2$/FiO$_2$ ratio was progressively increasing with a gradually lower FiO$_2$ on both NIV and HFNO from 80% to 40%. PS and PEEP were also reduced. Time on NIV was progressively reduced whereas HFNO increased during daytime (Figure 1).

On day 37th, NIV was interrupted and low-flow O$_2$ therapy was provided. On the same day, RPTs started a light/moderate intensity motor exercise training, sustained with conventional oxygen therapy (COT) to maintain SpO$_2$ > 93%. The patient had no specific impairment of motor abilities; however, he presented a movement-related dyspnea with O$_2$ desaturation. Exercises included sit-to-stand exercises and free walking without equipment, with a continuous monitoring of SpO$_2$, RR and heart rate. These activities were performed daily for 20 to 30 minutes. COT was gradually reduced from 10 l/min to 6l/min.

During the hospitalization period, medical therapy included hydroxychloroquine, methylprednisolone, bronchodilators, ceftriaxone, morphine, piperacillin-tazobactam and heparin.

At discharge, on 58th day, the patient was asymptomatic and eupneic with O$_2$ 2l/min. Two consecutive test results for SARS-CoV-2 were negative.

**Discussion**

The case report describes the prolonged follow-up of a patient affected by COVID-19 severe AHRF ventilated for a long time on progressive ventilatory support with CPAP, HFNO, NIV, and body positioning. The patient was successfully weaned from non-invasive support and discharged at home after almost two months.

NIV efficacy in hypoxemic patients is controversial. A recent meta-analysis conducted in severe AHRF showed that NIV reduced intubation and mortality rates [8]. However, it may delay endotracheal intubation increasing mortality rate [4,9]. Around 30% of NIV failure rate was observed in SARS and other viral pandemics [10,11]. Little is known about NIV efficacy in COVID-19. The scanty data showed more chances of success in patients with PaO$_2$/FiO$_2$ >150 [12]. Furthermore, it has been observed that patients with COVID-19 ARDS who were mechanically ventilated have longer CU stay, which makes administration of care more difficult. In patients surviving to severe ARDS, ICU length of stay was 26 (13-43) days in COVID-19 compared to 14 (7-23) days in others ARDS [13,3].

This was the case of our patient with prolonged NIV sessions and not eligible to invasive ventilation because of multiple comorbidities. Thus, NIVS was the only way to try to “bridge” the patient out of viral infection starting from COT, CPAP and HFNO to incrementing the support to NIV [14]. However,
based on our experience, the longer NIV is required the more is likely to fail because of intolerance and adverse effects, resulting in intubation and/or death.

This was a challenging case with a prolonged 32 days-period of NIVS 18 to 24 hours/day with PaO₂/FiO₂ <100 for 28 consecutive days. During some periods with NIV, the patient had a Vt >8ml/kg PBW. As already described, high Vt may increase transpulmonary pressure in the dependent regions provoking P-SILI [9]. Implementation of higher inspiratory pressures was not effective to reduce inspiratory effort, most likely due to the patient high inspiratory drive. Thus, RPTs increased PEEP up to 15 cmH₂O with a successful reduction of Vt in the safe range. High PEEP may balance the patient’s strong effort and counteract the P-SILI by homogeneous distribution of lung stress, better gas exchange and less efficient diaphragmatic contraction [15].

A hot topic during the pandemic was whether pronation could improve oxygenation during NIVS. A recent meta-analysis have shown feasibility, safety and oxygenation improvements in awake patients with COVID-19 [16]. In our case, oxygenation improved but it was not sustained after re-supination. Unfortunately, after the first week, the attempt to pronation caused a sudden drop in oxygenation. We may hypothesize that the effort to reach prone position in an awake patient with AHRF might be excessive in oxygen consumption.

Given the difficulty to maintain continuous and prolonged NIV sessions, we used HFNO as a bridge to improve patient tolerance. The use of a ventilator with dual NIV-HFNO mode facilitated the treatment, reducing the requirement of two devices [17]. After day 28, the patient started to have a fast oxygenation increase.

A limitation of this report is the lack of lung imaging during recovery. Another limitation was that due to the overload quantity of patients with COVID-19, we did not organize a specific rehabilitation program for these patients. Nevertheless, referral to rehabilitation facilities in Italy was very limited. Most of them were closed or converted to acute care hospitals. In our case, after the acute phase of respiratory failure, functional exercises were set up with the support of conventional O₂ as recommended by Vitacca et al. [18].

In our HDU RPTs were the frontline key personnel with a solid practical and theoretical knowledge in NIVS management, in particular in mask positioning and asynchronism detection. It is well established that the ability of a team is related to successful NIVS, making the treatment tolerable even for 24 hrs/day. Rate of NIV failure decrease when experience grows [19].
Conclusion

Many patients with AHRF during the COVID-19 outbreak could not be escalated to invasive mechanical ventilation due to poor functional status and saturated ICU. Even if it still not shared by international guidelines, NIVS has been implemented successfully. This case report shows how a skilled and experienced team made prolonged non-invasive support feasible for COVID-19 pneumonia, even outside ICU. A team with trained respiratory physiotherapists may have a particular important role in the successful implementation of NIV to improve hypoxemia and save lives.
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**Table 1.** Changes of ventilatory support mode, interfaces and settings during hospital stay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Day 1-8</th>
<th>Day 9-16</th>
<th>Day 17-27</th>
<th>Day 28-36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode</strong></td>
<td>CPAP</td>
<td>PSV</td>
<td>HFNO</td>
<td>PSV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interface</strong></td>
<td>Helmet/ Oronasal</td>
<td>Oronasal</td>
<td>Nasal prongs</td>
<td>Oronasal/ Total face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEEP (cmH₂O)</strong></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12/15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PS (cmH₂O)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10/12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HFNO (l/min)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FiO₂ (%)</strong></td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPAP, continuous positive airway pressure; PSV, pressure support ventilation; HFNO, high flow nasal oxygen; PS, pressure support; PEEP, positive end expiratory pressure; FiO₂, fraction of inspired oxygen.
**Figure 1.** Daily usage of ventilatory support and changes of PaO$_2$/FiO$_2$ ratio during the hospital stay.

CPAP, continuous positive airway pressure; PSV, pressure support ventilation; HFNO, high flow nasal oxygen; COT, conventional oxygen therapy. On the left side, arterial oxygen pressure/fraction of inspired oxygen (PaO$_2$/FiO$_2$, P/F) during the hospital stay represented by a black solid line with diamonds. On the right side, hours/day for each ventilatory support. Different ventilatory modalities are depicted with different ink grey colors, as reported in the graph legend.