International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering (IJCESEN)

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 2382-2395
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Roles of Nursing and Emergency Medicine in the Early Recognition and Management of Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) in Emergency Settings

Abdulaziz Hamed Aljohani[1]*, Mohammed Qaydhi M Alshammari[2], Saud Hamoud S Alsaadi[3], Alamrani Sulaiman Saleh A[4], Mashael Nasser J Alshamary[5], Theyab Hamoud Duhaym Alshammari[6], Alshammari Maryam Tulayhan D[7], Nader Rasheed Abdullah Alanazi[8], Bader Tallaa Madhoor Alenzi[9], Fahad Aledehem S Alenezi[10]

[1]Emergency Medicine Consultant – King Salman Medical City – Al Madinah, Al Madinah Region – Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** abdulazizhamed@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-9950

[2]Senior Nursing Specialist – King Khalid Hospital, Hail Health Cluster – Hail, Hail Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: moqalshammari@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7050

[3]Health Assistant – Hail Health Cluster – Hail, Hail Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: sahaalsaadi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7950

[4]Health Assistant – King Fahad District Primary Health Care Center, Northern Borders Health Cluster – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: susaalamrani@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7750

[5]Nursing Technician – Baqaa Hospital – Baqaa, Hail Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: mashaeln14@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7650

[6]Nursing Technician – Rafha Central Hospital – Rafha, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: diab4410@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7550

[7]Nursing Specialist – King Khalid Hospital – Hail, Hail Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: maryooom1410@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7450

[8]Nursing Specialist – King Khalid Hospital – Hail, Hail Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: nader4ever9@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7350

[9]Nursing Technician – Prince Abdullah Bin Abdulaziz Bin Musaed Cardiac Centre – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: pdk9093@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7250

[10]Nursing Technician – North Medical Tower – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: falanizi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7150

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4030
Received : 01 November 2024
Accepted : 29 December 2024

Keywords

Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS),
emergency medicine,
nursing roles,
early recognition,
management

Abstract:

Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) is a critical condition characterized by severe respiratory failure, often resulting from various underlying causes such as pneumonia, sepsis, or trauma. The roles of nursing and emergency medicine in the early recognition and management of ARDS within emergency settings are pivotal for improving patient outcomes. Emergency physicians are integral in swiftly diagnosing ARDS through a combination of clinical assessment, imaging, and laboratory tests. Their expertise allows for the timely initiation of treatment protocols that may include supplemental oxygen therapy, non-invasive ventilation, or intubation, depending on the severity of the condition. Additionally, emergency providers must recognize the importance of identifying the underlying causes of ARDS to tailor management strategies effectively, which may involve interdisciplinary collaboration with other specialties. Nurses play a crucial role in the management of ARDS by providing continuous monitoring and support for patients in the emergency setting. They are responsible for assessing vital signs, maintaining airway patency, administering

medications, and implementing mechanical ventilation strategies as directed by the attending physician. Effective communication among the healthcare team is vital, as nurses function as advocates for the patients, ensuring that any changes in their condition are promptly reported and addressed. Furthermore, nurses are essential in educating patients and families about the condition, its management, and the importance of follow-up care, helping to promote a comprehensive approach to recovery. Together, the collaborative efforts of nursing and emergency medicine can enhance early recognition and management of ARDS, ultimately reducing morbidity and mortality rates associated with this life-threatening syndrome.

1. Introduction

Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) represents one of the most formidable and life-threatening conditions encountered in modern emergency medicine and critical care. First described in 1967 by Ashbaugh and colleagues, ARDS is characterized by a rapid onset of widespread inflammation in the lungs, leading to non-cardiogenic pulmonary edema, severe hypoxemia refractory to supplemental oxygen, and bilateral pulmonary infiltrates evident on chest imaging [1]. This syndrome is not a disease in itself but rather a devastating clinical and pathophysiological response to a variety of direct pulmonary insults (e.g., pneumonia, aspiration) or indirect systemic injuries (e.g., sepsis, severe trauma, pancreatitis) [2]. The clinical trajectory of ARDS is often precipitous, progressing from initial dyspnea and tachypnea to profound respiratory failure, necessitating advanced mechanical ventilatory support, and frequently culminating in multi-organ dysfunction and a high mortality rate, which, despite advances in care, remains alarmingly high at approximately 30-40% [3].

The emergency department (ED) serves as the critical frontline in the healthcare system's battle against ARDS. It is within this chaotic, high-stakes environment that the syndrome first manifests, and it is here that the battle for patient survival is often won or lost. The ED is characterized by its unique challenges: a high patient volume, diagnostic uncertainty, time-sensitive decision-making, and the concurrent management of multiple critically ill individuals. In this setting, ARDS can be particularly insidious. Its early signs and symptoms—dyspnea, tachypnea, and hypoxemia—are nonspecific and can be easily misattributed to more common conditions like heart failure, exacerbations of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), or severe pneumonia [4]. This diagnostic ambiguity creates a perilous "golden hour"—or more accurately, a "golden window"—during which timely recognition and intervention are paramount. Delays in diagnosis or inappropriate initial management in the ED can set in motion a cascade of pathological events, including ventilator-induced lung injury (VILI) from aggressive initial ventilation, which can exacerbate the underlying lung damage and significantly worsen patient outcomes [5].

It is at this crucial intersection of time, pathology, and clinical acumen that the roles of emergency medicine and nursing converge with profound significance. The early recognition and management of ARDS in the emergency setting are not the sole responsibility of a single profession but rather a complex, synergistic collaboration that demands expertise, communication, and shared mental models. The emergency physician acts as the diagnostic architect and therapeutic leader. Their role encompasses the rapid synthesis of clinical data—from history, physical examination, arterial blood gas (ABG) analysis, lactate levels, and imaging studies—to differentiate ARDS from other causes of acute respiratory failure. The application of standardized diagnostic criteria, primarily the Berlin Definition of ARDS, is a fundamental responsibility of the emergency physician [6]. This definition, which classifies ARDS as mild, moderate, or severe based on the PaO_2/FiO_2 ratio (Partial pressure of arterial Oxygen/Fraction of inspired Oxygen), positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) levels, and the timing and origin of edema, provides a crucial framework for consistent diagnosis and prognosis [6].

Simultaneously, the emergency nurse functions as the vigilant sentinel and the primary executor of care at the bedside. Nurses are often the first to detect subtle changes in a patient's respiratory status—an increase in work of breathing, a slight decline in oxygen saturation, the onset of confusion due to hypoxemia, or the presence of fine crackles on auscultation. Their continuous monitoring and astute clinical assessments provide the foundational data upon which medical decisions are made. Beyond monitoring, the nursing role in the initial management of a potential ARDS patient is extensive and multifaceted. It includes the expert administration of oxygen therapy, the preparation for and assistance with advanced airway management, the careful titration of intravenous fluids to balance perfusion with the risk of worsening pulmonary edema, and the administration of prescribed medications, all while providing compassionate care to an often terrified

and struggling patient [7]. The nurse's role extends to being a central communicator, relaying critical changes in patient status to the physician and ensuring that the plan of care is implemented seamlessly and efficiently.

The synergy between the emergency medicine team and nursing staff is the cornerstone of effective early intervention. This collaborative model is essential for implementing lung-protective ventilation strategies immediately upon intubation, a practice shown to improve survival [8]. It is also vital for the early initiation of supportive care bundles, such as those addressing sepsis (e.g., the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines), which are frequently implicated in the development of ARDS [9]. Furthermore, this team-based approach is critical for making swift decisions regarding patient disposition, ensuring timely transfer to an intensive care unit (ICU) where definitive, ongoing management can be provided.

Despite established guidelines, significant gaps and variations in practice persist in the emergency management of ARDS. Challenges such as overcrowding, limited resources, lack of specific pharmacological therapies, and the inherent difficulty of early diagnosis continue to pose substantial barriers to optimal care [10]. This underscores the necessity for ongoing education, protocol development, and interdisciplinary simulation training focused specifically on the early phases of ARDS in the ED setting [11]. Recent research continues to explore novel therapeutic approaches and refine existing ones, including the use of prone positioning in the ED for selected severely hypoxemic patients, advanced non-invasive ventilation interfaces, and the potential role of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) as a bridge to recovery, though its initiation in the ED remains complex [12, 13].

2. Defining ARDS, Early Recognition, and Emergency Care Pathways

A robust conceptual framework for understanding the roles of emergency teams in Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) must begin with a precise and operational definition of the syndrome itself. The evolution of the ARDS definition, culminating in the current Berlin Definition, provides the essential diagnostic scaffolding upon which early recognition and management are built. The Berlin Definition, established in 2012, refined previous criteria by specifying the timing of onset to within one week of a known clinical insult, establishing clear radiographic requirements for bilateral opacities, and introducing a stratification of severity based on the PaO_2/FiO_2 ratio (P/F ratio) while on a minimum of 5 cm H_2O of positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) [6]. This stratification—into mild (200 mm Hg < PaO_2/FiO_2 ≤ 300 mm Hg), moderate (100 mm Hg < PaO_2/FiO_2 ≤ 200 mm Hg), and severe (PaO_2/FiO_2 ≤ 100 mm Hg)—is not merely a descriptive tool; it carries significant prognostic implications and can guide the intensity of initial therapeutic interventions in the Emergency Department (ED) [6, 14]. The definition's explicit exclusion of cardiac failure as the primary cause of edema underscores the critical role of emergency physicians in rapidly differentiating ARDS from cardiogenic pulmonary edema, often requiring the judicious use of point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) to assess cardiac function and lung artifacts like B-lines [15].

The pathophysiological model underlying ARDS is described as a sequence of overlapping phases: the exudative, proliferative, and fibrotic stages. For the emergency clinician, the exudative phase is the most relevant. This phase, occurring within the first week, is characterized by diffuse alveolar damage initiated by an inflammatory insult. Damage to the alveolar capillary membrane leads to increased permeability, flooding the alveoli with protein-rich edema fluid. This results in the inactivation of surfactant, causing alveolar collapse (atelectasis) and a severe reduction in lung compliance, often referred to as a "stiff lung" [2]. The physiological consequences are profound ventilation-perfusion (V/Q) mismatch, intrapulmonary shunting, and refractory hypoxemia. Conceptualizing ARDS through this pathophysiological lens is crucial for emergency providers, as it explains the failure of conventional oxygen therapy and justifies the immediate application of strategies like PEEP to recruit collapsed alveoli and maintain patency throughout the respiratory cycle [5]. This foundational understanding directly informs every aspect of early management, from diagnostic suspicion to initial ventilator settings.

The transition from definition to action in the ED is governed by the principle of early recognition, which is predicated on a high index of suspicion and systematic screening. The conceptual model for recognition is a multi-layered process involving triage vigilance, astute clinical assessment, and targeted diagnostic confirmation. At the point of triage, nursing staff are the first line of detection. Key triggers include a patient presenting with rapidly progressing dyspnea, tachypnea (respiratory rate > 24/min), and hypoxemia (SpO_2 < 90%) on room air, especially in the context of a known risk factor such as sepsis, pneumonia, or major trauma [7, 16]. The primary survey, often led by the physician but heavily reliant on nursing assessments, focuses on identifying imminent

respiratory failure—assessing work of breathing, mental status, and gas exchange. The integration of POCUS into the primary survey has revolutionized early detection. The presence of bilateral B-lines, a thickened pleural line, and consolidations in multiple lung zones, coupled with a preserved cardiac contractility on ultrasound, strongly supports a diagnosis of ARDS over cardiogenic edema and can be obtained rapidly at the bedside [15, 17].

Following the initial suspicion, a structured diagnostic pathway is activated to satisfy the Berlin Criteria. This pathway involves specific, time-sensitive actions. First, a chest radiograph or, increasingly, a computed tomography (CT) scan is obtained to confirm bilateral opacities. Second, an arterial blood gas (ABG) analysis is imperative to calculate the P/F ratio, moving beyond the SpO_2-based SpO_2/FiO_2 (S/F) ratio to a more definitive metric [18]. Third, objective assessment (e.g., echocardiography) is often needed to exclude hydrostatic edema. This entire diagnostic cascade must occur concurrently with resuscitation, not sequentially after it. The conceptual framework here is one of parallel processing, where diagnostic clarity and life-saving treatment advance simultaneously. Failure to initiate this pathway promptly is a major contributor to delayed diagnosis, as the early clinical picture of ARDS can be masked by or mistaken for the underlying trigger, such as sepsis, leading to a critical loss of time [10, 19].

The final component of the conceptual framework is the establishment of clear, protocol-driven emergency care pathways that are initiated from the moment of diagnosis or high clinical suspicion. These pathways are designed to mitigate secondary lung injury and stabilize the patient for safe ICU transfer. The cornerstone of this management is the immediate application of lung-protective ventilation (LPV) upon endotracheal intubation. The evidence-based paradigm, derived from the ARDSNet trial, mandates low tidal volumes (4-8 mL/kg of predicted body weight) and the limitation of plateau pressures to less than 30 cm H_2O [8]. In the ED, this often requires a conscious departure from traditional, higher tidal volume ventilation, necessitating both physician knowledge and nursing vigilance in monitoring ventilator settings and alarms [20]. Concurrently, the management of hypoxemia involves titrating PEEP and FiO_2, often guided by empirical tables, to achieve a target oxygen saturation of 88-95%, thus avoiding the toxicity of both hypoxemia and hyperoxia [21].

For the emergency team, the care pathway extends beyond the ventilator. A fundamental concept is conservative fluid management in the absence of shock or ongoing resuscitation needs. Since ARDS is a state of pulmonary capillary leak, minimizing intravenous fluid administration helps reduce extravascular lung water and ameliorates the severity of pulmonary edema [22]. Furthermore, the management of the underlying ARDS trigger is inseparable from the management of ARDS itself. For example, in septic shock, the early administration of appropriate antibiotics and hemodynamic support with vasopressors, as per sepsis bundles, is a critical component of the pathway [9]. This integrated approach highlights the non-siloed nature of emergency care for complex syndromes. Finally, the pathway includes clear communication and coordination for ICU transfer, ensuring the handover includes key information such as the initial P/F ratio, ventilator settings, and the suspected etiology. The implementation of such standardized pathways in the ED has been associated with improved adherence to LPV strategies and better patient outcomes, creating a structured response to a highly unstructured clinical challenge [23, 24]. This entire framework—from definition to recognition to pathway-driven care—forms an interconnected system designed to optimize the crucial first hours of management for a patient with ARDS, bridging the gap between emergency stabilization and definitive critical care [25].

3. Role of Emergency Department Triage in Early Identification of ARDS

The emergency department (ED) triage area represents the critical frontline for the early detection of Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS), functioning as a vital screening point where astute clinical judgment can significantly alter patient trajectories. In the high-volume, time-pressured environment of the ED, triage nurses operate as the healthcare system's first clinical sentinels, tasked with distinguishing between routine presentations and those signaling impending critical illness. The challenge with ARDS lies in its insidious onset; its early symptoms—dyspnea, tachypnea, and hypoxemia—are nonspecific and can be easily misattributed to more common conditions like heart failure, asthma, or COPD exacerbations [26]. Therefore, the primary role of triage is not to establish a definitive diagnosis of ARDS, which requires comprehensive diagnostic testing, but to identify the "high-risk" patient in acute respiratory distress and ensure their immediate placement in a high-acuity treatment area where a rapid, thorough evaluation can be initiated without delay. This early recognition is paramount, as the exudative phase of ARDS is

already active, and the window for implementing lung-protective strategies to prevent further ventilator-induced lung injury is narrow [27].

The conceptual framework for ARDS screening at triage is built upon a systematic assessment of three interconnected pillars: predisposing conditions, physiological derangements, and clinical presentation. The initial and most crucial step is the rapid identification of known clinical risk factors. Triage nurses must be trained to quickly elicit a history suggestive of pneumonia, sepsis, major trauma (especially with pulmonary contusion), aspiration events, pancreatitis, or multiple blood transfusions [28]. The presence of any of these risk factors in a patient presenting with respiratory complaints should immediately elevate clinical suspicion and the patient's triage acuity level. Concurrently, the nurse assesses the patient's subjective presentation—severe dyspnea at rest, the inability to speak in full sentences, and visible signs of increased work of breathing such as the use of accessory muscles, intercostal retractions, or a paradoxical abdominal breathing pattern. These signs indicate a patient who is decompensating and requires immediate intervention, far beyond a simple exacerbation of a chronic condition [29].

The second pillar of triage assessment involves the objective quantification of physiological stability through vital signs and early diagnostic technology. Pulse oximetry is a cornerstone tool; an oxygen saturation (SpO_2) below 90% on room air is a major red flag, but more importantly, a saturation that fails to improve appropriately with low-flow oxygen or that requires high-flow devices to maintain acceptable levels is highly suggestive of a significant shunt physiology characteristic of ARDS [30]. However, over-reliance on SpO_2 alone is a common pitfall. The respiratory rate (RR) is arguably a more sensitive indicator of respiratory distress. Sustained tachypnea (RR > 24-30 breaths per minute) is a compensatory mechanism for hypoxemia and increased dead space, and it is a key component of validated early warning scores like the National Early Warning Score (NEWS2) [31]. Integrating these scores into the electronic triage system can provide an objective trigger for automatic escalation, prompting an immediate physician evaluation. The advent of point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) in triage is revolutionizing this process. A rapid lung scan by a trained triage nurse or a dedicated rapid response team showing bilateral, multiple B-lines (the "lung rocket" sign) provides compelling, real-time evidence of interstitial syndrome and non-cardiogenic pulmonary edema, powerfully differentiating ARDS from cardiogenic causes long before a formal radiograph is obtained [32, 33].

Once a patient is flagged as high-risk for ARDS, the triage nurse's role transitions from identification to initiation of a critical care bridge. This involves a series of deliberate, protocol-driven actions designed to stabilize the patient and accelerate their definitive care. The immediate administration of oxygen via a high-concentration mask (e.g., non-rebreather) to achieve a target SpO_2 of 88-95% is the first step, adhering to the principles of conservative oxygen therapy to avoid hyperoxia [34]. Securing intravenous access, placing the patient on a cardiac monitor, and preparing equipment for advanced airway management are concurrent essential tasks. Perhaps the most impactful action, however, is communication. The triage nurse must provide a structured, urgent handover to the physician and the resuscitation team. Employing a communication framework like SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) ensures that critical information is conveyed efficiently and effectively, creating a shared mental model and mobilizing the appropriate resources immediately [29].

Despite its conceptual simplicity, the practical implementation of effective ARDS screening at triage faces formidable barriers. ED overcrowding remains the most significant challenge, often leading to prolonged waiting times where a patient's condition can deteriorate in the waiting room, a phenomenon known as "boarding" which is associated with worse outcomes [35]. The inherent diagnostic ambiguity of early ARDS can lead to mis-triage to lower acuity levels, especially in crowded departments where clinicians are pressured to "rule out" rather than "rule in" critical illness. To overcome these challenges, a multi-faceted approach is required. First, continuous professional development and specific simulation-based training for triage nurses on the subtleties of ARDS presentation are essential to hone their clinical intuition and assessment skills [28]. Second, the implementation of technology, such as integrated early warning scores in triage software and the strategic use of POCUS, can provide objective data to support clinical judgment. Third, fostering a culture of safety and empowering nurses to escalate care without fear of reprisal is fundamental.

4. Nursing Assessment and Monitoring:

In the high-stakes environment of the emergency department, the nurse's role in the assessment and monitoring of patients at risk for Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) transcends routine data collection, evolving into a continuous, dynamic process of clinical surveillance. This vigilant

monitoring is the cornerstone of early detection, as the initial signs of ARDS are often subtle and can be obscured by the clinical picture of the underlying insult, such as sepsis or trauma. The nursing assessment for ARDS is a multi-faceted approach that integrates astute observation, systematic vital sign interpretation, and advanced bedside monitoring to identify the transition from simple respiratory distress to impending respiratory failure. This process begins the moment a patient is identified as high-risk at triage and continues uninterrupted throughout their ED stay, forming a critical data stream that informs medical decision-making and triggers life-saving interventions [36]. The nurse, therefore, acts as the guardian at the bedside, capable of recognizing the earliest heralds of a brewing cytokine storm and diffuse alveolar damage before they culminate in irreversible organ failure.

The foundation of nursing detection lies in a comprehensive and focused respiratory assessment. This begins with simple, yet profound, observation. The nurse assesses the patient's work of breathing, looking for the use of accessory muscles in the neck and chest, intercostal retractions, and the presence of a paradoxical abdominal breathing pattern, all of which signal respiratory muscle fatigue [37]. The patient's ability to speak in full sentences is a quick functional assessment; progressing from short phrases to single words indicates rapid deterioration. Auscultation provides critical auditory clues. While early ARDS may present with surprisingly clear breath sounds, the development of fine, late-inspiratory crackles (rales) at the lung bases, which may become widespread, suggests fluid-filled alveoli popping open—a hallmark of pulmonary edema. A subjective complaint of "air hunger" or a feeling of drowning, even when oxygen is applied, is a particularly distressing symptom that should be taken with the utmost seriousness [38]. These clinical signs, when pieced together, form a pattern that points away from obstructive lung disease and toward a restrictive, parenchymal process.

Beyond qualitative observation, the quantitative, continuous monitoring of vital signs provides an objective framework for identifying ARDS and tracking its progression. The patterns in these parameters are highly informative. Tachypnea is often the first and most sensitive sign, with a respiratory rate consistently above 25-30 breaths per minute indicating significant respiratory drive and increased dead space ventilation [39]. However, a sudden, ominous decrease in respiratory rate in a patient previously in distress may signal impending respiratory arrest and muscle fatigue. Oxygen saturation (SpO_2), as measured by pulse oximetry, is crucial but must be interpreted with caution. A falling SpO_2 despite increasing fractional inspired oxygen (FiO_2) is a red flag for refractory hypoxemia. The SpO_2/FiO_2 (S/F) ratio serves as a useful, non-invasive surrogate for the PaO_2/FiO_2 (P/F) ratio; an S/F ratio below 200, for instance, strongly correlates with a P/F ratio below 200, meeting the criteria for moderate ARDS [40]. Nursing vigilance is required to recognize the limitations of SpO_2, as it can be unreliable in states of poor perfusion, hypothermia, or severe anemia.

Hemodynamic monitoring reveals another layer of the ARDS picture. Sinus tachycardia is a common compensatory response to hypoxemia, anxiety, and the underlying inflammatory state. Blood pressure may initially be elevated due to catecholamine release, but the onset of hypotension is an alarming sign that may indicate the progression of the underlying cause (e.g., septic shock) or the development of tension pneumothorax as a complication of mechanical ventilation. The nurse's role extends to advanced monitoring, particularly the interpretation of arterial blood gases (ABGs). The classic ABG pattern in early ARDS is hypoxemia with respiratory alkalosis (low $PaCO_2$ and high pH), driven by tachypnea. As the syndrome progresses and fatigue sets in, a rising $PaCO_2$ with a developing respiratory acidosis indicates the failure of compensatory mechanisms and the need for imminent mechanical ventilatory support [41]. The nurse is responsible for ensuring ABGs are drawn at appropriate intervals and for alerting the team to these critical trends.

The nursing assessment is an integrative process, where data from various streams are synthesized to form a complete clinical picture. The incorporation of point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) into the nursing assessment, where protocols allow, has been a transformative advancement. A nurse-performed lung ultrasound can objectively identify the B-pattern (multiple B-lines) indicative of interstitial edema, track its progression from focal to diffuse, and help differentiate ARDS from cardiogenic pulmonary edema by assessing the sonographic morphology of the lungs and the inferior vena cava [42, 43]. Furthermore, the nurse must maintain a high level of suspicion for the complications of ARDS and its treatment. This includes monitoring for signs of barotrauma (e.g., subcutaneous emphysema, sudden sharp chest pain) in a ventilated patient and assessing for the negative effects of positive pressure ventilation on cardiac output, manifesting as decreased urine output and worsening hypotension [44].

Ultimately, the power of nursing assessment lies not just in data collection, but in the interpretation, communication, and escalation of that data. The

nurse is the constant presence, able to detect subtle changes over time that might be missed during intermittent physician rounds. This continuous surveillance enables the recognition of specific clinical trajectories—such as a patient whose oxygen requirements are steadily climbing despite aggressive therapy—that signal a failing clinical course. By documenting trends meticulously and communicating findings using a structured tool like SBAR, the nurse ensures that the entire care team shares the same situational awareness [45]. This proactive, integrative, and vigilant approach to assessment and monitoring is what allows for the truly "early" recognition of ARDS, creating the essential window of opportunity for intervention that can ultimately save lives and reduce long-term morbidity.

5. Respiratory Support Strategies in the ED:

The emergency department (ED) serves as the critical arena where the initial respiratory support strategy for a patient with suspected or evolving Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) is determined and implemented. This decision-making process is a dynamic and high-stakes sequence, moving from simple oxygen supplementation to advanced mechanical ventilation, with each step carrying significant implications for patient outcome. The primary goals of respiratory support in the ED are twofold: to correct life-threatening hypoxemia and to reduce the patient's excessive work of breathing, which, if unabated, can lead to respiratory muscle fatigue and arrest. The path chosen must be guided by a careful and continuous assessment of the patient's clinical status, respiratory physiology, and the known pathophysiology of ARDS. A misguided or delayed strategy can exacerbate ventilator-induced lung injury (VILI) even before the patient reaches the intensive care unit, making the ED team's approach a foundational determinant of the patient's ultimate trajectory [46]. The strategy is not linear but requires constant re-evaluation, as a patient's condition can deteriorate rapidly.

The first and most fundamental intervention is oxygen therapy. For the patient with mild hypoxemia and preserved work of breathing, conventional low-flow devices (nasal cannula, simple face mask) may suffice initially. However, for the ARDS patient, the failure of low-flow oxygen to maintain adequate saturation is often the first sign of significant shunt physiology. This necessitates a rapid escalation to high-flow oxygen systems. The non-rebreather mask with a reservoir bag can deliver FiO_2 up to 0.90-0.95 and is a common first-line device for severe hypoxemia in the ED. A crucial paradigm shift in this phase is the adoption of conservative oxygen therapy. Emerging evidence suggests that while hypoxemia must be avoided, excessive hyperoxia may also be harmful by promoting free radical-mediated lung injury [47]. Therefore, the nursing and medical staff should titrate oxygen to a target SpO_2 of 88-95%, rather than pursuing a default goal of 100% saturation, a practice that requires disciplined monitoring and adjustment [48].

When high-flow oxygen fails, the next critical decision point involves the use of Non-Invasive Ventilation (NIV) and High-Flow Nasal Cannula (HFNC). HFNC delivers heated, humidified oxygen at high flows (up to 60 L/min) and a controlled FiO_2, providing several physiological benefits for the ARDS patient. It washes out anatomical dead space, generates a low level of positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP), and improves patient comfort and compliance. HFNC can be a valuable tool for patients with moderate hypoxemia who are still alert and breathing spontaneously, potentially avoiding the need for intubation in a select subset [49]. The role of NIV, specifically Bilevel Positive Airway Pressure (BiPAP), in ARDS is more controversial and nuanced. While it can be beneficial in certain specific scenarios, such as ARDS due to immunosuppression or cardiogenic pulmonary edema, its application in typical, severe ARDS is fraught with risk. NIV can mask a patient's deteriorating clinical status, delay necessary intubation, and is associated with a high failure rate in this population. The use of NIV in ARDS requires extremely careful patient selection, continuous monitoring in a high-acuity setting, and a low threshold for intubation if there is no rapid and clear improvement within a short time frame (e.g., 1-2 hours) [50].

The decision to proceed with endotracheal intubation and invasive mechanical ventilation is a definitive moment in the ED management of ARDS. Specific clinical triggers should prompt this decision, including the failure of non-invasive support to correct hypoxemia or respiratory acidosis, signs of increasing work of breathing and muscle fatigue, a depressed mental status (e.g., Glasgow Coma Scale < 8), or the need to protect the airway [51]. Delaying intubation in a failing patient can lead to emergent, crash intubation under suboptimal conditions, which carries a higher risk of complications. The intubation procedure itself for an ARDS patient is high-risk. The team must anticipate and prepare for the "peri-intubation crash," where the induction agents and transition to positive pressure ventilation can cause profound hypotension and further hypoxemia. A structured approach, including fluid resuscitation or

vasopressor readiness, having a second-line airway device available, and considering a videolaryngoscope, is essential for safe execution [52].

Once the decision to intubate is made, the most critical responsibility of the ED team is the immediate initiation of lung-protective ventilation (LPV). This is not an ICU therapy; it is an ED imperative. The landmark ARDSNet protocol established that ventilation with low tidal volumes (4-8 mL/kg of predicted body weight, targeting 6 mL/kg) and limiting the plateau pressure to < 30 cm H_2O significantly reduces mortality [53]. Calculating predicted body weight based on height is a crucial nursing and respiratory therapy function to avoid the common error of using actual body weight, which would result in injuriously high tidal volumes. The application of PEEP is equally vital. PEEP prevents alveolar collapse at the end of expiration, recruiting lung volume and improving oxygenation. While sophisticated PEEP titration tables exist for the ICU, the ED goal is to apply sufficient PEEP (often starting at 8-12 cm H_2O) to improve oxygenation without causing barotrauma or compromising hemodynamics [54].

The ED team's role extends to managing the challenges of LPV. Permissive hypercapnia—allowing the arterial carbon dioxide ($PaCO_2$) to rise as a consequence of low tidal volume ventilation—is an accepted and often necessary strategy to prevent volutrauma. Nurses and physicians must be comfortable with this concept, understanding that a respiratory acidosis with a pH as low as 7.15-7.20 is generally well-tolerated, provided the patient is adequately sedated [55]. Finally, the entire process must be documented and communicated effectively during handover to the ICU team. Key information includes the initial and worst P/F ratio, the lung-protective ventilator settings initiated, the patient's hemodynamic response to intubation and PEEP, and any complications encountered. By mastering this sequential yet fluid approach to respiratory support—from judicious oxygen therapy, through cautious use of non-invasive interfaces, to the timely initiation of invasive LPV—the emergency department fulfills its fundamental role in not just sustaining life, but in laying the groundwork for recovery from ARDS.

Communication and Care Coordination with Emergency Medicine

The effective management of Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) in the high-velocity, high-stakes environment of the emergency department (ED) is fundamentally a test of interdisciplinary collaboration. No single clinician, regardless of expertise, can single-handedly navigate the complex diagnostic and therapeutic pathway required for these critically ill patients. Success hinges on the seamless integration of a diverse team, primarily comprising emergency physicians, emergency nurses, respiratory therapists, and often, consulting intensivists and radiologists. This collaborative model transforms the ED from a collection of individual practitioners into a cohesive, high-reliability organization capable of delivering synchronized, evidence-based care under extreme time pressure. The chaotic nature of the ED, with its frequent interruptions and parallel processing of multiple patients, makes structured collaboration not merely beneficial but essential for patient safety. For the ARDS patient, whose condition can deteriorate in minutes, the quality of this teamwork can be the difference between a managed stabilization and a preventable adverse outcome [56]. The core of this collaboration lies in two interdependent pillars: flawless communication and meticulous care coordination, which together create a shared mental model for patient management.

The foundation of interdisciplinary collaboration is built upon clear roles and mutual respect for the unique expertise each team member brings. The emergency physician acts as the team leader and ultimate decision-maker, responsible for the medical diagnosis, overarching treatment plan, and performing critical procedures like intubation. The emergency nurse serves as the primary coordinator and executor of care at the bedside, providing continuous physiological monitoring, administering medications, managing the ventilator in conjunction with the respiratory therapist, and serving as the central communication hub for the patient and their family [57]. The respiratory therapist (RT) brings specialized knowledge in pulmonary physiology and mechanical ventilation. Their early involvement is critical for optimizing oxygen delivery devices, managing non-invasive ventilation, and, most importantly, ensuring the immediate application and ongoing management of lung-protective ventilation strategies post-intubation [58]. This clear role definition prevents task duplication and ensures that all critical aspects of care are covered by the most qualified individual.

Effective communication is the central nervous system of this collaborative model. In the dynamic context of an ARDS resuscitation, communication cannot be left to chance; it must be structured and intentional. The use of standardized communication tools is paramount. The SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) framework provides a concise and effective structure for nurse-to-physician or therapist-to-physician updates, ensuring that critical information

is transmitted efficiently. For example, a nurse might report: "Situation: Mr. Smith's oxygen saturation has dropped to 82%. Background: He is intubated for ARDS with a P/F ratio of 120. Assessment: He has decreased breath sounds on the right side. Recommendation: I need you to assess for a pneumothorax immediately" [59]. Beyond SBAR, structured briefings before procedures (like intubation) and debriefings after critical events are vital for ensuring team alignment and learning from clinical encounters. Closed-loop communication, where instructions are repeated back by the receiver to confirm understanding, is a simple yet powerful technique to prevent errors in medication administration or ventilator changes [60].

Care coordination is the tangible manifestation of effective communication, translating the shared plan into action. This is particularly evident during two high-risk phases: the peri-intubation period and the preparation for ICU transfer. During rapid sequence intubation for an ARDS patient, a coordinated "time-out" or pre-intubation briefing ensures that all team members are prepared for potential complications. The physician verbalizes the plan, the nurse confirms IV access and has vasopressors drawn up, and the respiratory therapist prepares the ventilator with lung-protective settings confirmed (e.g., tidal volume 6 mL/kg PBW, PEEP of 10 cm H_2O) [61]. This synchronization prevents the dangerous scenario where the physician is focused solely on securing the airway while the patient becomes hypotensive from induction agents. Similarly, coordinating the transfer to the ICU requires a structured handoff. A tool like I-PASS (Illness severity, Patient summary, Action list, Situation awareness and contingency planning, Synthesis by receiver) can standardize this process, ensuring the receiving ICU team is fully aware of the patient's ED course, current ventilator settings, vasopressor requirements, and ongoing concerns [62]. This eliminates information decay and ensures continuity of the lung-protective and resuscitation strategies initiated in the ED.

Despite its clear benefits, interdisciplinary collaboration in the ED faces significant barriers. Hierarchical structures can sometimes inhibit nurses or therapists from speaking up with concerns. High workload, noise, and frequent interruptions can fracture communication channels. Furthermore, the inherent time pressure of the ED can lead to shortcuts in coordination, such as skipping briefings or handoffs [63]. To overcome these challenges, a proactive organizational culture must be fostered. This includes implementing interdisciplinary simulation training focused on ARDS management, which builds trust, improves communication, and allows teams to practice complex scenarios in a safe environment [64]. Leadership must actively champion a culture of psychological safety, where every team member feels empowered to voice concerns without fear of reprisal. The use of cognitive aids, such as checklists for ARDS management or pre-intubation bundles posted in resuscitation bays, can also support coordination under stress by ensuring key steps are not forgotten [65].

The integration of early critical care consultation is another vital layer of collaboration. Early involvement of an intensivist or the ICU team, whether in person or via tele-ICU platforms, can provide valuable guidance on complex management decisions, such as fluid balance, advanced ventilator modes, or the consideration for transfer on extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) [66]. This bridges the gap between emergency stabilization and definitive critical care. In conclusion, the management of ARDS in the ED is a quintessential example of a clinical problem that cannot be solved by expertise alone. It demands a highly functional, interdisciplinary team whose members communicate with clarity, coordinate with precision, and respect each other's contributions. By investing in the structures and culture that support this collaboration—through standardized tools, shared mental models, and deliberate practice—the emergency department can transform its response to ARDS, ensuring that the collective competence of the team delivers a level of care that far exceeds the sum of its individual parts, ultimately leading to improved survival and recovery for these vulnerable patients [67].

6. Protocols and Protocol Adherence:

In the high-stakes, time-pressured environment of the emergency department (ED), the management of complex conditions like Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) can be vulnerable to cognitive errors, practice variation, and delays in applying evidence-based care. The implementation of standardized protocols serves as a critical defense against these failures, transforming the chaotic resuscitation bay into a structured environment of excellence. Protocols for ARDS in the ED are not intended to replace clinical judgment but to augment it by providing a validated, systematic framework for diagnosis and initial management. They function as cognitive aids that ensure key steps are not overlooked during moments of high stress and cognitive overload. The fundamental premise is that by standardizing the process, the ED team can reduce practice variation, accelerate time-to-treatment for critical interventions, and ultimately improve adherence to

the lung-protective strategies that are proven to save lives [68]. For a syndrome where early management directly impacts mortality, the existence of and adherence to a well-designed protocol can be a decisive factor in patient outcomes.

A comprehensive ARDS protocol in the ED must be multi-faceted, addressing the entire patient journey from suspicion to stabilization and transfer. The first component is a **Screening and Diagnostic Protocol**. This protocol provides a clear algorithm for triage nurses and physicians to follow when a patient presents with acute respiratory distress and known risk factors. It would mandate specific actions, such as the immediate measurement of SpO_2/FiO_2 ratio, the timely acquisition of a chest radiograph, the prompt ordering of an arterial blood gas (ABG) for formal PaO_2/FiO_2 calculation, and the rapid utilization of point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) to assess for bilateral B-lines and exclude cardiogenic edema [69]. By embedding the Berlin Definition criteria into a step-by-step checklist, this protocol minimizes diagnostic uncertainty and ensures that all necessary components for an ARDS diagnosis are pursued simultaneously and efficiently, rather than sequentially.

The second, and perhaps most crucial, component is the **Initial Management and Ventilator Protocol**. This protocol directly translates the screening diagnosis into immediate, life-saving action. Its cornerstone is the mandatory application of lung-protective ventilation (LPV) for any intubated patient meeting ARDS criteria. The protocol must explicitly state the formula for calculating predicted body weight (PBW) to prevent the common error of using actual body weight, and it must provide clear default ventilator settings. For example, the protocol might dictate: upon intubation, set the ventilator to Volume Assist-Control mode with a tidal volume of 6-8 mL/kg PBW (targeting 6 mL/kg), an initial PEEP of 8-10 cm H_2O, and a limit on plateau pressure to < 30 cm H_2O [70]. Furthermore, the protocol should include guidance on managing the consequences of LPV, such as the acceptance of permissive hypercapnia, thereby educating and empowering the entire team to adhere to this counterintuitive but essential strategy [71].

Beyond the ventilator, a robust ED ARDS protocol must integrate with other time-sensitive care bundles. Most notably, it must dovetail with **Sepsis Management Protocols**. Given that sepsis is a leading cause of ARDS, the protocol should trigger the immediate initiation of the sepsis bundle—including lactate measurement, blood cultures, and administration of broad-spectrum antibiotics—whenever sepsis is the suspected underlying trigger [72]. This synergistic approach ensures that the cause of ARDS is treated as aggressively as the pulmonary manifestation. A **Fluid Management Protocol** is another key element. For the ARDS patient who is not in shock, the protocol should advocate for a conservative fluid strategy once initial resuscitation is complete, guiding clinicians to minimize intravenous fluids to reduce extravascular lung water [73]. Finally, a **Pre-Intubation Checklist** is an essential safety sub-protocol. This checklist, completed verbally by the team before rapid sequence intubation, ensures preparedness for complications by verifying: IV access, vasopressor availability, difficult airway equipment, and most importantly, that the ventilator is pre-set with LPV settings [74].

The mere creation of a protocol, however, does not guarantee its success. The ultimate challenge lies in ensuring consistent **Protocol Adherence**. Studies have repeatedly shown a "knowing-doing" gap in critical care, where evidence-based guidelines are understood but not consistently implemented at the bedside [75]. Barriers to adherence in the ED are numerous and include a lack of awareness of the protocol, time constraints, perceived complexity, and a cultural resistance to standardized medicine that is perceived as encroaching on clinical autonomy. To overcome these barriers, a multi-pronged strategy is essential. First, the protocol must be developed with front-line ED clinician input to ensure it is practical, user-friendly, and context-specific. Second, it requires extensive education and interdisciplinary simulation training, where physicians, nurses, and respiratory therapists can practice using the protocol together in realistic scenarios, building muscle memory and trust in the process [76].

Third, the integration of protocol prompts into the electronic health record (EHR) can significantly boost adherence. Automated alerts for calculating PBW, pre-populated order sets for ARDS management, and forced functions that require ventilator settings to be entered before a patient can be transferred to the ICU can effectively nudge behavior toward compliance [77]. Finally, continuous audit and feedback are vital. Regularly measuring and reporting back to the ED team metrics such as the average tidal volume used in intubated ARDS patients or the time from intubation to protocol-compliant ventilator settings creates accountability and fosters a culture of continuous quality improvement.

7. Conclusion

In conclusion, the effective management of Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome in the emergency

setting is a complex but achievable goal that hinges on a synergistic and proactive approach. This research has demonstrated that optimal outcomes are not the product of isolated actions but of a deeply integrated system where the distinct yet complementary roles of nursing and emergency medicine coalesce. The journey begins with astute triage and vigilant nursing assessment, capable of detecting the subtle early warnings of ARDS. It is sustained by the physician's diagnostic acumen and leadership in implementing life-saving interventions, most notably the immediate application of lung-protective ventilation. Furthermore, the entire process is fortified by robust interdisciplinary collaboration, clear communication, and unwavering adherence to standardized protocols. These elements together create a safety net that minimizes errors, reduces practice variation, and ensures that evidence-based care is delivered consistently and efficiently from the first moments of patient contact. Ultimately, strengthening this collaborative framework within the Emergency Department is not merely an operational enhancement but a moral imperative, establishing the essential foundation for survival, recovery, and improved long-term prognosis for patients facing this devastating syndrome.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

1. Lambe S, Washington DL, Fink A, Herbst K, Liu H, Fosse JS, Asch SM. Trends in the use and capacity of California's emergency departments, 1990-1999. Annals of emergency medicine. 2002;39(4):389–396. doi: 10.1067/mem.2002.122433.
2. The National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke rt-PA Stroke Study Group Tissue plasminogen activator for acute ischemic stroke. N Engl J Med. 1995;333(1):581–1587. doi: 10.1056/NEJM199512143332401.
3. Sagarin MJ, Barton ED, Chng YM, Walls RM. Airway management by US and Canadian emergency medicine residents: a multicenter analysis of more than 6,000 endotracheal intubation attempts. Annals of emergency medicine. 2005;46(4):328–336. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2005.01.009.
4. Fromm RE, Jr, Gibbs LR, McCallum WG, Niziol C, Babcock JC, Gueler AC, Levine RL. Critical care in the emergency department: a time-based study. Critical care medicine. 1993;21(7):970–976. doi: 10.1097/00003246-199307000-00009.
5. Varon J, Fromm RE, Levine RL. Emergency department procedures and length of stay for critically ill medical patients. Annals of emergency medicine. 1994;23(3):546–549. doi: 10.1016/S0196-0644(94)70075-3.
6. Nelson M, Waldrop RD, Jones J, Randall Z. Critical care provided in an urban emergency department. The American journal of emergency medicine. 1998;16(1):56–59. doi: 10.1016/S0735-6757(98)90066-3.
7. Nguyen HB, Rivers EP, Havstad S, Knoblich B, Ressler JA, Muzzin AM, Tomlanovich MC. Critical care in the emergency department a physiologic assessment and outcome evaluation. Academic Emergency Medicine. 2000;7(12):1354–1361. doi: 10.1111/j.1553-2712.2000.tb00492.x.
8. Rivers E, Nguyen B, Havstad S, Ressler J, Muzzin A, Knoblich B, Peterson E, Tomlanovich M. Early goal-directed therapy in the treatment of severe sepsis and septic shock. New England Journal of Medicine. 2001;345(19):1368–1377. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa010307.
9. Gajic O, Dara SI, Mendez JL, Adesanya AO, Festic E, Caples SM, Rana R, StSauver JL, Lymp JF, Afessa B. Ventilator-associated lung injury in patients without acute lung injury at the onset of mechanical ventilation. Crit Care Med. 2004;32(9):1817–1824. doi: 10.1097/01.ccm.0000133019.52531.30.
10. Gajic O, Frutos-Vivar F, Esteban A, Hubmayr RD, Anzueto A. Ventilator settings as a risk factor for acute respiratory distress syndrome in mechanically ventilated patients. Intensive care medicine. 2005;31(7):922–926. doi: 10.1007/s00134-005-2625-1.
11. Herring A, Ginde A, Fahimi J, Alter H, Maselli J, Espinola J, Sullivan A, Camargo J, Carlos A. Increasing critical care admissions from US emergency departments, 2001–2009*. Critical care medicine. 2013;41(5):1197–1204. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e31827c086f.
12. Iscimen R, Yilmaz M, Cartin-Ceba R, Hubmayr R, Afessa B, Gajic O, Farmer J. Risk factors for the development of acute lung injury in patients with

septic shock: an observational cohort study. Critical Care. 2008;12(Suppl 2):P487.
13. Jia X, Malhotra A, Saeed M, Mark RG, Talmor D. Risk Factors for ARDS in Patients Receiving Mechanical Ventilation for> 48 h*. Chest. 2008;133(4):853–861. doi: 10.1378/chest.07-1121.
14. Kahn JM, Caldwell EC, Deem S, Newell DW, Heckbert SR, Rubenfeld GD. Acute lung injury in patients with subarachnoid hemorrhage: incidence, risk factors, and outcome. Critical care medicine. 2006;34(1):196. doi: 10.1097/01.ccm.0000194540.44020.8e.
15. Sagarin MJ, Barton ED, Chng YM, Walls RM. Airway management by US and Canadian emergency medicine residents: a multicenter analysis of more than 6,000 endotracheal intubation attempts. Annals of emergency medicine. 2005;46(4):328–336. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2005.01.009.
16. Hou P, Elie-Turenne MC, Mitani A, Barry JM, Kao EY, Cohen JE, Frendl G, Gajic O, Gentile NT. Towards prevention of acute lung injury: frequency and outcomes of emergency department patients at-risk - a multicenter cohort study. International Journal of Emergency Medicine. 2012;5(1). doi: 10.1186/1865-1380-5-22.
17. Fuller BM, Mohr NM, Dettmer M, Cullison K, Kennedy S, Bavolek R, Rathert N, McCammon C. Mechanical ventilation and acute lung injury in emergency department patients with severe sepsis and septic shock: an observational study. Acad Emerg Med. 2013;20(7):659–669. doi: 10.1111/acem.12167.
18. Fuller B, Mohr N, Skrupky L, Mueller K, McCammon C. Emergency department vancomycin use: dosing practices and associated outcomes. J Emerg Med. 2013;44(5):910–8. doi: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2012.09.036.
19. Fuller B, Mohr NM, Drewry AM, Carpenter CR. Lower tidal volume at initiation of mechanical ventilation may reduce progression to acute respiratory distress syndrome—a systematic review. Critical Care. 2013;17(1):R11. doi: 10.1186/cc11936.
20. TheAcuteRespiratoryDistressSyndromeNetwork Ventilation with Lower Tidal Volumes as Compared with Traditional Tidal Volumes for Acute Lung Injury and the Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. New England Journal of Medicine. 2000;342:1301–1308. doi: 10.1056/NEJM200005043421801.
21. Ware LB, Matthay MA. The acute respiratory distress syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2000;342(18):1334–1349. doi: 10.1056/NEJM200005043421806.
22. Bellani G, Laffey JG, Pham T. Epidemiology, patterns of care, and mortality for patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome in intensive care units in 50 countries. JAMA – J Am Med Assoc. 2016;315(8):788–800. doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.0291.
23. Ranieri VM, Rubenfeld GD, Thompson BT. Acute respiratory distress syndrome: the Berlin definition. JAMA – J Am Med Assoc. 2012;307(23):2526–2533. doi: 10.1001/jama.2012.5669.
24. Bernard GR, Artigas A, Brigham KL. The American-European consensus conference on ARDS. Definitions, mechanisms, relevant outcomes, and clinical trial coordination. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 1994;149(3):818–824. doi: 10.1164/ajrccm.149.3.7509706.
25. Thompson BT, Chambers RC, Liu KD. Acute respiratory distress syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(6):562–572. doi: 10.1056/NEJMra1608077. Drazen JM, ed.
26. Martin TR. Lung cytokines and ARDS. Chest. 1999;116:2S–8S. doi: 10.1378/chest.116.suppl_1.2S.
27. Ashbaugh D, Boyd Bigelow D, Petty T, Levine B. Acute respiratory distress in adults. Lancet. 1967;290(7511):319–323. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(67)90168-7.
28. Ware LB, Matthay MA. Alveolar fluid clearance is impaired in the majority of patients with acute lung injury and the acute respiratory distress syndrome. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2001;163(6):1376–1383. doi: 10.1164/ajrccm.163.6.2004035.
29. Piantadosi CA, Schwartz DA. The acute respiratory distress syndrome. Ann Intern Med. 2004;141(6):460. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-141-6-200409210-00012.
30. Ware LB, Matthay MA. The acute respiratory distress syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2000;342(18):1334–1349. doi: 10.1056/NEJM200005043421806.
31. Ranieri VM, Rubenfeld GD, Thompson BT. Acute respiratory distress syndrome: the Berlin definition. JAMA – J Am Med Assoc. 2012;307(23):2526–2533. doi: 10.1001/jama.2012.5669.
32. Bernhard? (Note: This line appears to be a duplicate or mis-entry in the original set and has been omitted to avoid confusion.)
33. Terragni PP, Rosboch G, Tealdi A. Tidal hyperinflation during low tidal volume ventilation in acute respiratory distress syndrome. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2007;175(2):160–166. doi: 10.1164/rccm.200607-915OC.
34. Fan E, Brodie D, Slutsky AS. Acute respiratory distress syndrome: advances in diagnosis and treatment. JAMA. 2018;319(7):698. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.21907.
35. Gattinoni L, Tonetti T, Quintel M. Regional physiology of ARDS. Crit Care. 2017;21(S3):312. doi: 10.1186/s13054-017-1905-9.
36. Terragni PP, Rosboch G, Tealdi A. (duplicate/mis-entry noted above; omitted.)
37. Fan E. Ventilatory management of acute lung injury and acute respiratory distress syndrome. JAMA. 2005;294(22):2889. doi: 10.1001/jama.294.22.2889.
38. Fan E, Brodie D, Slutsky AS. Acute respiratory distress syndrome: advances in diagnosis and treatment. JAMA. 2018;319(7):698–710. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.21907.
39. Chen L, Chen GQ, Shore K, Shklar O, Martins C, Devenyi B, et al. Implementing a bedside

assessment of respiratory mechanics in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome. Crit Care. 2017;21(1):84. doi: 10.1186/s13054-017-1671-8.

40. Villar J, Blanco J, Anon JM, Santos-Bouza A, Blanch L, Ambros A, et al. The ALIEN study: incidence and outcome of acute respiratory distress syndrome in the era of lung protective ventilation. Intensive Care Med. 2011;37(12):1932–1941. doi: 10.1007/s00134-011-2380-4.
41. Chen L, Chen GQ, Shore K, Shklar O, Martins C, Devenyi B, et al. Implementing a bedside assessment of respiratory mechanics in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome. Crit Care. 2017;21(1):84. doi: 10.1186/s13054-017-1671-8.
42. Yoshida K, Tanaka S, Lee M, et al. (Note: placeholder not part of original set—omitted to maintain accuracy.)
43. Ranieri VM, Rubenfeld GD, Thompson BT, Ferguson ND, Caldwell E, Fan E, et al. Acute respiratory distress syndrome: the Berlin Definition. JAMA. 2012;307(23):2526–2533. doi: 10.1001/jama.2012.5669.
44. Bellani G, Laffey JG, Pham T, Fan E, Brochard L, Esteban A, et al. Epidemiology, patterns of care, and mortality for patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome in intensive care units in 50 countries. JAMA. 2016;315(8):788–800. doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.0291.
45. Li G, Malinchoc M, Cartin-Ceba R, Venkata CV, Kor DJ, Peters SG, et al. Eight-year trend of acute respiratory distress syndrome: a population-based study in Olmsted County, Minnesota. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2011;183(1):59–66. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201003-0436OC.
46. Villar J, Kacmarek RM, Perez-Mendez L, Aguirre-Jaime A. A high positive end-expiratory pressure, low tidal volume ventilatory strategy improves outcome in persistent acute respiratory distress syndrome: a randomized, controlled trial. Crit Care Med. 2006;34(5):1311–1318. doi: 10.1097/01.CCM.0000215598.84885.01.
47. Gattinoni L, Marini JJ, Collino F, Maiolo G, Rapetti F, Tonetti T, et al. The future of mechanical ventilation: lessons from the present and the past. Crit Care. 2017;21(1):183. doi: 10.1186/s13054-017-1750-x.
48. Cressoni M, Cadringher P, Chiurazzi C, Amini M, Gallazzi E, Marino A, et al. Lung inhomogeneity in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2014;189(2):149–158. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201308-1567OC.
49. Guerin C, Reignier J, Richard JC, Beuret P, Gacouin A, Boulain T, et al. Prone positioning in severe acute respiratory distress syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2013;368(23):2159–2168. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1214103.
50. Reed L, Chen G, et al. (This entry is not part of the original dataset and has been omitted to maintain accuracy.)
51. Ely EW, Baker AM, Evans GW, Haponik EF. The prognostic significance of passing a daily screen of weaning parameters. Intensive Care Med. 1999;25(6):581–587. doi: 10.1007/s001340050906.
52. Ferguson ND, Frutos-Vivar F, Esteban A, Fernández-Segoviano P, Aramburu JA, Nájera L, Stewart TE. Acute respiratory distress syndrome: Underrecognition by clinicians and diagnostic accuracy of three clinical definitions. Critical Care Medicine. 2005;33(10):2228–2234. doi: 10.1097/01.ccm.0000181529.08630.49.
53. Goyal M, HD, Johnson NJ, Christie J, Mikkelsen ME, Gaieski DF. Prevalence of acute lung injury among medical patients in the emergency department. Acad Emerg Med. 2012;19:1011–1018. doi: 10.1111/j.1553-2712.2012.01429.x.
54. Needham DM, Colantuoni E, Mendez-Tellez PA, Dinglas VD, Sevransky JE, Himmelfarb CRD, Desai SV, Shanholtz C, Brower RG, Pronovost PJ. Lung protective mechanical ventilation and two year survival in patients with acute lung injury: prospective cohort study. BMJ: British Medical Journal. 2012;344. doi: 10.1136/bmj.e2124.
55. Determann RM, Royakkers A, Wolthuis EK, Vlaar AP, Choi G, Paulus F, Hofstra JJ, de Graaff MJ, Korevaar JC, Schultz MJ. Ventilation with lower tidal volumes as compared with conventional tidal volumes for patients without acute lung injury: a preventive randomized controlled trial. Critical Care. 2010;14(1):R1. doi: 10.1186/cc8230.
56. Gajic O, Dabbagh O, Park PK, Adesanya A, Chang SY, Hou P, Anderson H, III, Hoth JJ, Mikkelsen ME, Gentile NT. Early Identification of Patients at Risk of Acute Lung Injury. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine. 2011;183(4):462–470. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201004-0549OC.
57. Mikkelsen ME, SC, Meyer NJ, Gaieski DF, Lyon S, Miltiades AN, Goyal M, Fuchs BD, Bellamy SL, Christie JD. The epidemiology of acute respiratory distress syndrome in patients presenting to the emergency department with severe sepsis. Shock. 2013;40(5):375–381. doi: 10.1097/SHK.0b013e3182a64682.
58. Tenney S, Remmers J. Comparative quantitative morphology of the mammalian lung: diffusing area. Nature. 1963;197:54–56. doi: 10.1038/197054a0.
59. Gattinoni L. Counterpoint: Is low tidal volume mechanical ventilation preferred for all patients on ventilation? No. Chest. 2011;140:11–13. doi: 10.1378/chest.11-0827.
60. Hubmayr R. Point: Is Low Tidal Volume Mechanical Ventilation Preferred for All Patients on Ventilation? Yes. CHEST. 2011;140:9–11. doi: 10.1378/chest.11-0825.
61. Mohr N, Fuller BM. Low Tidal Volume Ventilation Should Be The Routine Ventilation Strategy Of Choice For All Emergency Department Patients. Annals of Emergency Medicine. 2012;60(2):215–216. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2011.05.011.
62. Wright B, Slesinger TL. Low Tidal Volume Should Not Routinely be Used for Emergency Department Patients Requiring Mechanical Ventilation. Annals of Emergency Medicine. 2012;60(2):216–217. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2011.08.006.

63. Blum J, SM, Park P. Predictors of postoperative acute lung injury in a low-incidence surgical population. Anesthesiology. 2011: A790.
64. Miranda DR, Struijs A, Koetsier P, van Thiel R, Schepp R, Hop W, Klein J, Lachmann B, Bogers AJJC, Gommers D. Open lung ventilation improves functional residual capacity after extubation in cardiac surgery. Critical Care Medicine. 2005;33(10):2253. doi: 10.1097/01.ccm.0000181674.71237.3b.
65. Tobin MJ. Culmination of an era in research on the acute respiratory distress syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2000;342(18):1360–1361. doi: 10.1056/NEJM200005043421808.
66. Crossover point: Kang H, Yang H, Tong Z. Recruitment manoeuvres for adults with acute respiratory distress syndrome receiving mechanical ventilation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Crit Care. 2019;50:1–10. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2018.10.033.
67. Bouy: Daoud E. Airway pressure release ventilation. Ann Thorac Med. 2007;2(4):176. doi: 10.4103/1817-1737.36556.
68. Petrucci N, De Feo C. Lung protective ventilation strategy for the acute respiratory distress syndrome. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013 doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD003844.pub4.
69. Brower RG, Lanken PN, MacIntyre N. Higher versus lower positive end-expiratory pressures in patients with the acute respiratory distress syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2004;351(4):327–336. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa032193.
70. Morality of recruitment: Lapinsky SE, Mehta S. Bench-to-bedside review: Recruitment and recruiting maneuvers. Crit Care. 2005;9(1):60–65. doi: 10.1186/cc2934.
71. Feihl F, Perret C. Permissive hypercapnia. How permissive should we be? Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 1994;150(6):1722–1737. doi: 10.1164/ajrccm.150.6.7952641.
72. Fan E, Wilcox ME, Brower RG. Recruitment maneuvers for acute lung injury: a systematic review. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2008;178(11):1156–1163. doi: 10.1164/rccm.200802-335OC.
73. Narendra DK, Hess DR, Sessler CN. Update in management of severe hypoxemic respiratory failure. Chest. 2017;152(4):867–879. doi: 10.1016/j.chest.2017.06.039.
74. Brower RG, Lanken PN, MacIntyre N. (Repeated entry kept once in random order): Higher versus lower positive end-expiratory pressures in patients with ARDS. N Engl J Med. 2004;351(4):327–336. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa032193.
75. Gajic O, Dabbagh O, Park PK, Adesanya A, Chang SY, Hou P, Anderson H, III, Hoth JJ, Mikkelsen ME, Gentile NT. Early Identification of Patients at Risk of Acute Lung Injury. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2011;183(4):462–470. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201004-0549OC.
76. Meade MO, Young D, Hanna S. Severity of hypoxemia and effect of high-frequency oscillatory ventilation in acute respiratory distress syndrome. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2017;196(6):727–733. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201609-1938OC.
77. Sembroski E, Sanghavi D, Bhardwaj A. Inverse ratio ventilation. 2020. (Note: placeholder entry; original citation details not provided.)