

LETTER

Open Access



The knowns and unknowns of perfusion disturbances in COVID-19 pneumonia

Mattia Busana^{1*} and Lorenzo Giosa²

Editor,

Ball et al. [1] recently proposed a thoughtful quantitative analysis of gas and blood distribution in the lungs of patients with severe COVID-19 pneumonia. The paper offers some interesting cues that we consider worth discussing.

First, the images of dual-energy CT scan (DECT) were used as surrogates of the ventilation and perfusion distribution in the lung. However, other imaging techniques, like scintigraphy and SPECT, might be more suitable for this task. Indeed, while perfusion is likely accurately depicted by DECT, ventilation is not. Indeed, for at least two reasons, the gas content measured by this technique (notably during tidal breathing and not at constant airway pressure) may not represent a good surrogate of the distribution of ventilation:

1. Airway closure may dissociate the instantaneous gas volume from the actual ventilation, and the phenomenon may be more common than currently thought [2];
2. The opening pressures cannot be investigated by a single CT scan [3]. It follows that undetected recruitability (possibly nonlinear along the pressure–volume curve) may contribute to the uncoupling between measured gas volume and alveolar ventilation.

This leads, in our opinion, to some inconsistencies. Most importantly, in Fig. 4, the authors show a plot reasonably inspired by the V_A/Q_T distributions obtained with the multiple inert gas elimination technique. Unfortunately, such distribution is likely far from what we may expect

from COVID-19 pneumonia. Indeed, the displayed distributions are essentially centered on a gas–blood volume ratio ~ 1 . However, as we have shown in our theoretical model [4], such distribution (coupled with the relatively low shunt fraction reported in Table 2) is not compatible with the severe hypoxemia observed in these patients.

As a side note, considering that the analysis performed by Ball et al. excluded large vessels, one may wonder how the presence of abnormal vasodilation and vascular anastomoses [5] would affect their results. Indeed, *non-functional* vessels in a “gas-rich” region may escape the definition of shunt used by the authors.

Conclusions

The impact of perfusion alterations on gas exchange in COVID-19 is far from being understood. Despite the aforementioned limitations, Ball et al. must be congratulated for their effort in reporting compelling data that represent a smart step forward in the understanding and, most importantly, in the quantification of the problem.

Reply to: The knowns and unknowns of perfusion disturbances in COVID-19 pneumonia

Lorenzo Ball, Chiara Robba, Jacob Herrmann, Sarah E. Gerard, Yi Xin, Maura Mandelli, Denise Battaglini, Iole Brunetti, Giuseppe Minetti, Sara Seitun, Giulio Bovio, Antonio Vena, Daniele Roberto Giacobbe, Matteo Bassetti, Patricia R.M. Rocco, Maurizio Cereda, Rahim R. Rizzi, Lucio Castellan, Nicolò Patroniti and Paolo Pelosi

This comment refers to the article available online at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-021-03610-9>.

*Correspondence: mat.busana@gmail.com

¹ Department of Anesthesiology, University Medical Center Göttingen,

Robert Koch Straße 40, 37075 Göttingen, Germany

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2021. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

We would like to thank Dr. Busana and Dr. Giosa for their interest in our study [1] and for giving us the opportunity to expand the discussion regarding disturbances of lung perfusion in COVID-19 patients. They highlighted the differences between ventilation and static aeration as assessed by CT; questioned the interpretation of our gas: blood ratio distribution plots and the definition of shunt, comparing our in vivo results with those of their computational theoretical model [4]. As per local practice during the COVID-19 pandemic, CT scans were acquired during breath-hold and we used lung aeration to define shunt, dead space, and non-aerated/non-perfused areas. Lung aeration may be considered as a potential surrogate of ventilation, especially when protective tidal volume and limited inspiratory plateau pressure are used, as in the case of COVID-19 mechanically ventilated patients [6]. In this context, it seems reasonable to assume that non-aerated areas are also non-ventilated and that aerated regions receive a certain amount of ventilation, especially given the small extent of hyperaeration and poor recruitment with application of PEEP observed in these patients [7]. The pulmonary gas: blood volume ratio was defined as:

$$\text{Gas: Blood volume ratio} = \frac{f_A \cdot \overline{PBV}}{\overline{PBV} \cdot f_A}$$

namely as the ratio of mean-normalized gas fraction to mean-normalized pulmonary blood volume: based on this definition, the values of the ratio are centered around 1 in each patient and cannot be directly translated into V'_A/Q'_T without knowing the cardiac output and alveolar minute ventilation. Such a ratio allows within-patient comparisons of the relative distribution of aeration and perfusion. We excluded only large lung vessels from the analysis: the vasodilation of peripheral vessels affects V'_A/Q'_T at an anatomical scale well below the size of one CT voxel [8]: voxels comprising dilated vessels and patent alveoli would have an intermediate CT attenuation value and a high pulmonary blood volume, corresponding to our “gas: blood ratio < 1” compartment.

Despite several technical limitations of the technique we proposed, our overall interpretation of the data is that in the early stages of the disease, hypoxia is explained by low V'_A/Q'_T responsive to higher inspiratory oxygen fractions and non-invasive respiratory assistance, while also by increased true shunt in the late stages requiring invasive mechanical ventilation.

In conclusion, we believe that our data should not be interpreted as in contrast with your theoretical model, but rather could represent its confirmation and an attempt of explaining in vivo gas-exchange changes in critically ill patients with severe COVID-19 pneumonia.

Abbreviations

DECT: Dual-energy CT scan; SPECT: Single photon emission computed tomography; V'_A/Q'_T : Ventilation–perfusion distribution.

Acknowledgements

None.

Authors' contributions

Both authors participated in the writing of the present letter.

Funding

NA.

Availability of data and materials

NA.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

NA.

Consent for publication

All authors approved the manuscript in the current form.

Competing interests

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Author details

¹Department of Anesthesiology, University Medical Center Göttingen, Robert Koch Straße 40, 37075 Göttingen, Germany. ²Department of Surgical Sciences, University of Turin, Turin, Italy.

Received: 22 July 2021 Accepted: 23 July 2021

Published online: 28 September 2021

References

- Ball L, Robba C, Herrmann J, Gerard SE, Xin Y, Mandelli M, et al. Lung distribution of gas and blood volume in critically ill COVID-19 patients: a quantitative dual-energy computed tomography study. *Crit Care*. 2021;25:214.
- Hedenstierna G, Chen L, Brochard L. Airway closure, more harmful than atelectasis in intensive care? *Intensive Care Med*. 2020;46:2373–6.
- Cressoni M, Chiumello D, Algieri I, Brioni M, Chiurazzi C, Colombo A, et al. Opening pressures and atelectrauma in acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Intensive Care Med*. 2017;43:603–11.
- Busana M, Giosa L, Cressoni M, Gasperetti A, Di Girolamo L, Martinelli A, et al. The impact of ventilation-perfusion inequality in COVID-19: a computational model. *J Appl Physiol*. 2021;130(3):865–76. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00871.2020>.
- Galambos C, Bush D, Abman SH. Intrapulmonary bronchopulmonary anastomoses in COVID-19 respiratory failure. *Eur Respir J*. 2021;2004397.
- Gattinoni L, Pelosi P, Crotti S, Valenza F. Effects of positive end-expiratory pressure on regional distribution of tidal volume and recruitment in adult respiratory distress syndrome. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 1995;151:1807–14.
- Ball L, Robba C, Maiello L, Herrmann J, Gerard SE, Xin Y, et al. Computed tomography assessment of PEEP-induced alveolar recruitment in patients with severe COVID-19 pneumonia. *Crit Care Lond Engl*. 2021;25:81.
- Townsend MI. Structure and composition of pulmonary arteries, capillaries, and veins. *Comp Physiol*. 2012;2:675–709.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.