

# Cardiac output estimation based on arterial and venous blood gas analysis: proposal of a monitoring method

David Santiago Giraldo Gutiérrez<sup>1</sup>, Juan José Velásquez Gutiérrez<sup>2</sup>, Joaquín Octavio Ruiz-Villa<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Anesthesiologist – Fundación Hospital de la Misericordia and Hospital Universitario Nacional, Colombia

<sup>2</sup>Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Anesthesiologist – Fundación Hospital de la Misericordia, Colombia

<sup>3</sup>Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Anesthesiologist – Clínica los Rosales S.A., Colombia

## Abstract

Hemodynamic optimization is vital in high risk surgical patients or in high risk surgical procedures. The main objective of hemodynamic management is to maintain tissue perfusion and preserve aerobic metabolism through a cardiac output coupled with the metabolic demand. The technologies used for cardiac output monitoring use special techniques (e.g. lithium dilution or transpulmonary thermodilution) or implementation of dedicated devices with considerable rates of potential complications (pulmonary artery catheter). Thus, we propose a novel method to estimate cardiac output through the analysis of arteriovenous blood gases which could be an alternative to more expensive methods (minimally invasive devices, pulmonary artery catheter). A review of several formulas described in the literature to compute the variables needed to calculate cardiac output with the Fick principle was carried out. These formulas estimate the oxygen consumption using the O<sub>2</sub> sensor integrated in the anesthesia workstation. The other variables in the Fick equation are derived from the arterial and venous blood gas analysis and parameters obtained from mechanical ventilators. By integrating the data gathered from the publications found, the authors created a comprehensive formula for calculation of cardiac output and the cardiac index using the parameters obtained from blood gas analysis. The presented method provides a more accessible and affordable way to monitor cardiac output in surgical high-risk patients in an environment with limited resources.

**Key words:** hemodynamic monitoring, cardiac output, blood gas analysis, monitoring, intraoperative, anesthesiology, critical care.

Anaesthesiol Intensive Ther 2021; 53, 2: 179–183

Received: 17.06.2020, accepted: 20.09.2020

## CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Joaquín Octavio Ruiz-Villa, Clínica los Rosales SA, Cll 12 #33-55, Ceiba Grande de Canaán, Pereira, 660003, Colombia, e-mail: [joruizvilla@gmail.com](mailto:joruizvilla@gmail.com)

Hemodynamic optimization is vital in high risk surgical patients. The aim is to achieve an adequate coupling between oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>) supply and metabolic demands in an organism under surgical stress, thus preserving aerobic metabolism. Tissue perfusion does not necessarily correlate with arterial blood pressure. Instead, cardiac output is the most important variable that determines tissue oxygen supply.

Monitoring based on the pulmonary artery catheter is considered the gold standard for cardiac output (CO) assessment. It is an expensive and invasive method with usefulness in various clinical conditions being a matter of debate [1, 2].

Nowadays, there are minimally invasive hemodynamic monitoring methods available. They are based on the estimation of cardiac output through the analysis of the pulse wave contour, such as the FloTrac system (Edwards Lifesciences, Irvine, CA,

USA) that requires arterial cannulation, providing information on blood pressure, cardiac function and probability of response to volume. More advanced examples are the VolumeView system (Edwards Lifesciences, Irvine, CA, USA), which requires cannulation of the femoral artery and a central venous catheter to provide information on cardiac function and volumetric data. Data are obtained from the transpulmonary thermodilution method. Other examples, using dilution methods, are the PiCCO system (Pulsion Medical System, Munich, Germany) and LiDCO system (LiDCO Ltd, London, United Kingdom). These systems can provide information on the hemodynamic status of critically ill patients and can also be used in the perioperative setting. Although abovementioned devices have made it possible to improve the treatment of critically ill patients and optimize goal-directed therapy, they are expensive, not commonly available, and have

shown limitations in providing reliable data in different contexts [3–5].

One of the areas of recent progress in monitoring is the increasing availability of non-invasive methods. There are several techniques, such as applanation tonometry, for example, the T-Line system (Tensys Medical, San Diego, CA, USA), which has shown similar accuracy in blood pressure measurement compared to the arterial catheter [6]. However, it does not correlate with the pressures obtained from an arterial catheter in critically ill patients, and the use of vasoactive agents and patient movements affect the result of measurements [6–8]. Volume clamp methods, such as the Clear-Sight system (Edwards Lifesciences, Irvine, CA, USA) and CNAP system (CNSystems Medizintechnik, Graz, Austria) have an adequate level of compliance for the measurement of cardiac output compared to the pulmonary artery catheter and good correlation with transthoracic Doppler ultrasound [9, 10]. Even though the risk of complications with these devices is low, the capacity to measure cardiac output based on the pulse wave contour analysis has, according to a meta-analysis of 16 studies, a weighted percentage of error of 46.4% [11].

The German doctor Adolf Eugen Fick proposed a mathematical method to calculate cardiac output using oxygen consumption and arterial and mixed-venous blood oxygen content. This method, known as the Fick principle, has been a reference standard to compute cardiac output for the last century [12]. It is possible to use this resource to estimate cardiac output with data obtained from O<sub>2</sub> and carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) sensors built into anesthesia machines and from arterial and mixed venous blood gas analysis.

Arterial line and central venous catheter placement are common procedures in high risk surgical patients and the widespread availability of blood gas analysis in tertiary care centers makes the proposed method of CO estimation a reasonable alternative in the vast majority of patients, without the necessity of additional or special devices.

If we consider that O<sub>2</sub> consumption is equal to the product of CO multiplied by the arterio-venous difference of O<sub>2</sub> content, it is possible to rearrange the equation as follows:

$$VO_2 = (CO \times CaO_2 - CvO_2) \quad (1)$$

$$CO = \frac{VO_2}{(CaO_2 - CvO_2)} \quad (2)$$

where:  $VO_2$  is oxygen consumption,  $CO$  is cardiac output,  $CaO_2$  is arterial oxygen content and  $CvO_2$  is venous oxygen content.

Data from arterial and venous blood gas analysis allows us to determine their respective oxygen con-

tents, thus completing the equation's (2) denominator [13].

$$CaO_2 = \{(Hg \times 1.36 \times SaO_2) + (PaO_2 + 0.0031)\} \times 10 \quad (3)$$

$$CvO_2 = \{(Hg \times 1.36 \times SvO_2) + (PvO_2 + 0.0031)\} \times 10 \quad (4)$$

where:  $CaO_2$  is the oxygen content of arterial blood measured in mL L<sup>-1</sup>,  $CvO_2$  is the oxygen content of venous blood measured in mL L<sup>-1</sup>,  $Hg$  is hemoglobin expressed in g dL<sup>-1</sup>, the value 1.36 corresponds to the oxygen-carrying capacity per g of Hg (1.36 mL of O<sub>2</sub> per 1 g of Hg),  $SaO_2$  is the arterial O<sub>2</sub> saturation in decimals,  $PaO_2$  is the arterial O<sub>2</sub> pressure expressed in mm Hg,  $SvO_2$  is the venous O<sub>2</sub> saturation in decimals,  $PvO_2$  is the venous O<sub>2</sub> pressure expressed in mm Hg, and the value of 0.0031 corresponds to the dissolved or unbound oxygen fraction per each 100 mL of blood. Then the value is multiplied by 10 in order to convert the units from mL dL<sup>-1</sup> to mL L<sup>-1</sup>.

The pulmonary artery catheter allows the monitoring of mixed venous oxygen saturation ( $SvO_2$ ), while a central venous line allows measurement of central venous oxygen saturation ( $ScvO_2$ ). The first one reflects global O<sub>2</sub> extraction, and the second one the upper body's extraction degree. Both variables assess the relationship between oxygen supply and consumption and tissue perfusion, thus allowing them to be assumed as an indirect reference to cardiac output. Because the use of  $SvO_2$  and  $ScvO_2$  has a positive influence on results of treatments of critically ill patients, it is possible to use these parameters as objectives during goal-guided therapy,  $ScvO_2 > 70\%$  or a  $SvO_2 > 65\%$  in both critically ill septic and non-septic patients being the fixed threshold during resuscitation [14].

Venous oxygen saturation differs between individuals and relies on O<sub>2</sub> extraction, which varies according to cell requirements. Inferior vena cava oxygen saturation is commonly higher than that in the superior vena cava. In the pulmonary artery (PA) there is a mixture of blood coming from both the upper and lower body, so the oxygen saturation in PA blood is an intermediate between both inferior and superior cava veins. In the right atrium, mixed blood is a partial mixture, so oxygen saturation depends on the degree of venous return and catheter tip location.

Intraoperatively,  $ScvO_2$  can reach values up to 6% higher than  $SvO_2$ . This depends on the effect of inhaled anesthetics on blood flow and cerebral oxygen extraction [15].  $ScvO_2$  and  $SvO_2$  are similar in healthy patients, the former being 2–3% lower, due to the contribution from several vascular networks to the inferior vena cava, in which oxidative phosphorylation is reduced under certain conditions (renal, portal, hepatic flow). During shock, the coefficient of variation can exceed  $\pm 20\%$  [14, 16].

It is explained by differential changes in blood flow and  $O_2$  extraction (higher in brain and splanchnic circulation) [17]. Considering that in the absence of anemia and hypoxemia (which means adequate  $CaO_2$ ), low values of  $SvO_2$  and  $ScvO_2$  correlate with a reduced cardiac output, trends in their values become helpful during resuscitation and intraoperative management.

$ScvO_2$  is clinically accessible and less invasive than  $SvO_2$ , gaining more relevance. Studies carried out in critically ill patients have revealed that during parallel measurements of  $ScvO_2$  and  $SvO_2$  they correlate in 90% of cases,  $ScvO_2$  being  $7 \pm 4$  (%) higher than  $SvO_2$  [18]. These findings suggest that  $ScvO_2$  has the potential to represent changes in the  $O_2$  supply/consumption relationship in critically ill patients; even when absolute numeric values of both  $ScvO_2$  and  $SvO_2$  are not the same, the trend of  $ScvO_2$  values during serial measurements can serve as a guiding parameter.

It is also possible to obtain blood samples to measure atrial blood gases. Perez *et al.* [19] assessed the agreement between  $O_2$  atrium blood saturation ( $RAvO_2$ ) and  $SvO_2$  in pediatric critically ill patients with catecholamine-resistant septic and cardiogenic shock. They found minimal differences (1–5% changes in  $SvO_2$  represent changes in  $RAvO_2$  in 79% of cases) with a concordance correlation coefficient of 0.90. Given that it is a venous mixture at the right atrium, global oxygen extraction could be better represented at this level than the one represented in the venous mixture sampled from the superior cava vein.

Given the abovementioned limitations and knowing the physiological differences between each type of venous blood and giving more relevance to trends than to absolute values, it is possible to skip the insertion of a pulmonary artery catheter and replace  $SvO_2$  with  $RAvO_2$  or  $ScvO_2$  to estimate the arteriovenous  $O_2$  difference through Fick's equation.

Although the estimation of  $O_2$  consumption requires specialized measurement methods, such as indirect calorimetry, it is possible to approach it via information provided by an anesthesia workstation. Sykes suggested an equation to estimate  $O_2$  consumption through the data from an oxygen sensor installed in an anesthesia breathing circuit when using low fresh gas flows [20]. The difference between the inspired oxygen fraction ( $FiO_2$ ) and the expired oxygen fraction ( $ETO_2$ ) corresponds to a proportion of minute ventilation, which allows oxygen consumption to be calculated:

$$VO_2 = (FiO_2 \times ETO_2) \times MV \quad (5)$$

where:  $VO_2$  is "oxygen consumption",  $FiO_2$  is the "inspired oxygen fraction",  $ETO_2$  is "expired oxygen fraction" and  $MV$  is "minute ventilation".

Ritchie-Mclean and Shankar [21] suggested a modification to this formula by replacing minute ventilation with alveolar ventilation as minute ventilation includes dead space ventilation. This can enhance estimation of  $VO_2$  with low tidal volumes.

$$VO_2 = (FiO_2 \times ETO_2) \times VA \quad (6)$$

where:  $VO_2$  is in  $mL \min^{-1}$ ,  $FiO_2$  is in decimals,  $ETO_2$  is in decimals,  $VA$  is alveolar ventilation in  $mL \min^{-1}$ .

The Bohr equation allows one to calculate alveolar volume using arterial  $CO_2$  pressure ( $PaCO_2$ ):

$$\frac{VD}{VT} = \frac{(PaCO_2 - ETCO_2)}{PaCO_2} \quad (7)$$

$$VD = VT \times \frac{(PaCO_2 - ETCO_2)}{PaCO_2} \quad (8)$$

where:  $VD$  is "dead space volume" in mL,  $VT$  is "tidal volume" in mL,  $PaCO_2$  is in mm Hg,  $ETCO_2$  is "end tidal  $CO_2$ " in mm Hg.

The anesthesia workstation ventilator allows the control of tidal volume ( $VT$ ). Considering that  $VT$  equals the sum of  $VD$  and  $VA$ , it is possible to estimate  $VA$  once "dead space ventilation" is known with equation 7.

$$VT = VD + VA \quad (9)$$

$$VA = VT - VD \quad (10)$$

Alveolar ventilation is calculated by multiplying  $VA$  by the respiratory rate ( $RR$ ) set on the ventilator:

$$\dot{V}A = VA \times RR \quad (11)$$

where:  $\dot{V}A$  is alveolar ventilation in  $mL \min^{-1}$ ,  $VA$  is alveolar volume in ml,  $RR$  is the respiratory rate in breaths  $\min^{-1}$ .

Solving the equation by rearrangement of the variables results in equation 12:

$$\dot{V}A = RR \times \left\{ VT - \left[ \frac{(PaCO_2 - ETCO_2)}{PaCO_2} \right] \right\} \quad (12)$$

Thus, using a modified Sykes equation (6) and arteriovenous blood gas values it is possible to calculate cardiac output:

$$CO = \frac{(VO_2)}{(CaO_2 - CvO_2)} \quad (2)$$

↓ replacing numerator by equation 6.

$$CO = \frac{[(FiO_2 \times ETO_2) \times VA]}{(CaO_2 - CvO_2)} \quad (13)$$

where,

$$\dot{V}A = RR \times \left\{ VT - \left[ VT \times \left( \frac{(PaCO_2 - ETCO_2)}{PaCO_2} \right) \right] \right\} \quad (12)$$

Cardiac index is the result of the division between cardiac output and total body surface area. This value is more useful in pediatric patients.

Described method is based on monitoring devices routinely used in high risk surgical patients. Blood gas analyzers can be found in most perioperative units. Hence it would not be strictly necessary to have special equipment such as invasive monitoring devices with a pulmonary artery catheter or pulse contour analysis device, which are not generally available in all anesthesia services.

Arteriovenous gas analysis allows the clinician, in addition to cardiac output estimation, to assess perfusion parameters such as  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$ ,  $\text{O}_2$  extraction rate, oxygen supply ( $\text{DO}_2$ ), and acid-base analysis ( $\Delta$  hydrogen ion concentration, strong ion difference, serum lactate). Gomez-Duque *et al.* [22] proposed a formula to calculate pulmonary shunt:

$$Q_s/Q_t = \left[ \frac{(1 - \text{SaO}_2)}{(1 - \text{SvO}_2)} \right] + (\text{FiO}_2 \times 0.13) \quad (14)$$

where:  $Q_s/Q_t$  is the relationship between shunt flow and total flow,  $\text{SaO}_2$  is  $\text{O}_2$  saturation in arterial blood gases,  $\text{SvO}_2$  is oxygen saturation in central or atrium venous blood,  $\text{FiO}_2$  is the inspired fraction of  $\text{O}_2$ .

With central venous pressure (CVP), mean arterial pressure (MAP) and the previous calculation of cardiac output, the clinician can calculate systemic vascular resistance and the systemic vascular resistance index:

$$\text{SVR} = \frac{(\text{MAP} - \text{CVP})}{\text{CO}} \quad (15)$$

$$\text{SVRI} = \frac{(\text{MAP} - \text{CVP})}{\text{CI}} \quad (16)$$

In the Bohr equation, the  $\text{CO}_2$  value corresponds to average  $\text{CO}_2$ , not  $\text{ETCO}_2$ . Using  $\text{ETCO}_2$  to calculate dead space can lead to an underestimation of average  $\text{CO}_2$  [23]. Using the Sykes equation without modifications could avoid variability since tidal volume (VT) is known and constant according to ventilatory parameters. Some anesthesia machines include volumetric  $\text{CO}_2$  monitors that allow average  $\text{CO}_2$  quantification with an adequate agreement compared to metabolic analyzers [24]. In case of having access to these machines, average  $\text{CO}_2$  should replace the  $\text{ETCO}_2$  value to provide higher accuracy in estimation.

In our opinion, the most relevant limitation of the proposed method is the impossibility to get continuous or real-time measurements, so we suggest an initial measurement before incision, followed by scheduled measurements to identify trends and determine changes in management. We propose hourly measurements in unstable or high-risk patients. The other patients could be tested every 2–3 hours or, depending on the clinical

criteria, according to the decision of the anesthesiologist in charge of the patient.

In neonates and infants, several difficulties in mechanical ventilation and higher respiratory rate can lead to inaccuracy in  $\text{ETCO}_2$  values. With reduced blood volume, frequent blood sampling can lead to anemia and hemodynamic instability. That is why we recommend this method in patients weighing over 20 kg. If used in smaller patients, we propose sampling the minimal blood volume needed for processing blood gas analysis according to the equipment specifications of each institution, and also to distance as much as possible the time of sampling.

The method is subject to indirect estimations of some physiological variables. Estimating oxygen consumption using the Sykes equation has not been validated, so its use could be the principal source of error. Another problem is the impossibility to extract mixed venous blood with a central venous catheter. If possible, the anesthesiologist should position the tip of the catheter in the right atrium in order to get a percentage of blood mixture from both cava veins, getting closer to the values in the pulmonary artery. It is possible to achieve catheter placement by coupling a pressure transducer to the distal port of the central line looking for the ventricular waveform, then retracting the catheter until the waveform changes back to atrium characteristics. Another alternative to waveform analysis in catheter tip placement is the use of fluoroscopy during catheter insertion, but it implies additional resources, time and radiation exposure to the patient and medical staff.

According to the previous discussion, we consider trends analysis more important than relying on absolute and single measurements. Interpretation always must be subject to clinical information of the case. Further evaluations should be undertaken to validate this method compared to the gold standard (pulmonary artery catheter) or equivalents such as minimally invasive cardiac output monitoring devices.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. Financial support and sponsorship: none.
2. Conflict of interest: none.

## REFERENCES

1. Kobe J, Mishra N, Arya VK, Al-Moustadi W, Nates W, Kumar B. Cardiac output monitoring: technology and choice. *Ann Card Anaesth* 2019; 22: 6-17. doi: 10.4103/aca.ACA\_41\_18.
2. Vincent JL. The pulmonary artery catheter. *J Clin Monit Comput* 2012; 26: 341-345. doi: 10.1007/s10877-012-9389-2.
3. Geisen M, Ganter MT, Hartnack S, Dzemali O, Hofer CK, Zollinger A. Accuracy, precision, and trending of 4 pulse wave analysis techniques in the postoperative period. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth* 2018; 32: 715-722. doi: 10.1053/j.jvca.2017.09.006.
4. Saraceni E, Rossi S, Persona P, et al. Comparison of two methods for cardiac output measurement in critically ill patients. *Br J Anaesth* 2011; 106: 690-694. doi: 10.1093/bja/aer030.

5. Herner A, Heilmaier M, Mayr U, Schmid RM, Huber W. Comparison of cardiac function index derived from femoral and jugular indicator injection for transpulmonary thermodilution with the PiCCO-device: a prospective observational study. *PLoS One* 2018; 13: e0200740. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0200740.
6. Saugel B, Meidert AS, Hapfelmeier A, Eyer F, Schmid RM, Huber W. Non-invasive continuous arterial pressure measurement based on radial artery tonometry in the intensive care unit: a method comparison study using the T-Line TL-200pro device. *Br J Anaesth* 2013; 111: 185-190. doi: 10.1093/bja/aet025.
7. Saugel B, Fassio F, Hapfelmeier A, Meidert AS, Schmid RM, Huber W. The T-line TL-200 system for continuous non-invasive blood pressure measurement in medical intensive care unit patients. *Intensive Care Med* 2012; 38: 1471-1477. doi: 10.1007/s00134-012-2617-x.
8. Nelson MR, Stepanek J, Cevette M, Covalciuc M, Hurst RT, Tajik AJ. Noninvasive measurement of central vascular pressures with arterial tonometry: clinical revival of the pulse pressure waveform? *Mayo Clin Proc* 2010; 85: 460-472. doi: 10.4065/mcp.2009.0336.
9. Ameloot K, Palmers PJ, Malbrain MLNG. The accuracy of non-invasive cardiac output and pressure measurements with finger cuff: a concise review. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2015; 21: 232-239. doi: 10.1097/MCC.000000000000198.
10. Van Der Spoel AGE, Voogel AJ, Folkers A, Boer C, Bouwman RA. Comparison of noninvasive continuous arterial waveform analysis (Nexfin) with transthoracic Doppler echocardiography for monitoring of cardiac output. *J Clin Anesth* 2012; 24: 304-309. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinane.2011.09.008.
11. Peyton PJ, Chong SW. Minimally invasive measurement of cardiac output during surgery and critical care: a meta-analysis of accuracy and precision. *Anesthesiology* 2010; 113: 1220-1235. doi: 10.1097/ALN.0b013e3181ee3130.
12. Sigurdsson TS, Lindberg L. Indirect calorimetry overestimates oxygen consumption in young children: caution is advised using direct Fick method as a reference method in cardiac output comparison studies. *Pediatr Cardiol* 2020; 41: 149-154. doi: 10.1007/s00246-019-02238-5.
13. Pinsky M, Brochard L, Mancebo J, Hedenstierna G. *Fisiología aplicada en medicina de cuidado intensivo*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Editorial D (ed.). Bogotá; 2012.
14. Squara P. Central venous oxygenation: when physiology explains apparent discrepancies. *Crit Care* 2014; 18: 579. doi: 10.1186/s13054-014-0579-9.
15. Carrillo-Esper R, Núñez-Bacarreza JJ, Carrillo-Córdova JR. Saturación venosa central. *Conceptos actuales*. *Rev Mex Anestesiología* 2007; 30: 165-171.
16. Hartog C, Bloos F. Venous oxygen saturation. *Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol* 2014; 28: 419-428. doi: 10.1016/j.bpa.2014.09.006.
17. Tanczos K, Molnar Z. The oxygen supply-demand balance: a monitoring challenge. *Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol* 2013; 27: 201-207. doi: 10.1016/j.bpa.2013.06.001.
18. Reinhart K, Kuhn HJ, Hartog C, Bredle DL. Continuous central venous and pulmonary artery oxygen saturation monitoring in the critically ill. *Intensive Care Med* 2004; 30: 1572-1578. doi: 10.1007/s00134-004-2337-y.
19. Perez AC, Eulmesekian PG, Mincez PG, Schnitzler EJ. Adequate agreement between venous oxygen saturation in right atrium and pulmonary artery in critically ill children. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2009; 10: 76-79. doi: 10.1097/PCC.0b013e318193699d.
20. Sykes O. Oxygen monitoring during low flow anaesthesia. *J Clin Monit Comput* 2010; 24: 141. doi: 10.1007/s10877-010-9222-8.
21. Ritchie-McLean S, Shankar R. Calculating oxygen consumption during low-flow anaesthesia. *Anaesthesia* 2017; 72: 789. doi: 10.1111/anae.13899.
22. Gómez Duque A, Fernández G, Augusto Gutiérrez Á, et al. Cálculo de los contenidos arterial y venoso de oxígeno, de la diferencia arteriovenosa de oxígeno, tasa de extracción tisular de oxígeno y shunt intrapulmonar con unas nuevas fórmulas, basadas en la saturación de oxígeno. *Rev la Fac Med* 2000; 48: 67-76.
23. Sykes O, Rahlf-Luong M. Calculating oxygen consumption during low flow anaesthesia. A reply. *Anaesthesia* 2017; 72: 1286-1287. doi: 10.1111/anae.14047.
24. Siobal MS, Ong H, Valdes J, Tang J. Calculation of physiologic dead space: comparison of ventilator volumetric capnography to measurements by metabolic analyzer and volumetric CO<sub>2</sub> monitor. *Respir Care* 2013; 58: 1143-1151. doi: 10.4187/respcare.02116.