

Resistive Load During CPAP and Automatic Tube Compensation (ATC): A Bench Comparison of ICU Ventilators

Ben Fabry¹, Christian Kuster¹, Roland Francis²

¹ Department of Physics, Friedrich-Alexander Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen, Germany

² Department of Anesthesiology, Universitätsklinikum Erlangen, Friedrich-Alexander Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen, Germany

Corresponding author:

Ben Fabry
Department of Physics
Friedrich-Alexander Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg
Henkestr. 91
91052 Erlangen
Germany
+49 9131 85 25610
ben.fabry@fau.de

Abstract

Background: Automatic tube compensation (ATC) was designed to compensate for the additional resistive load imposed by the endotracheal tube during spontaneous breathing. In ATC mode, the ventilator adds or subtracts the flow-dependent pressure drop across the tube during both inspiration and expiration so that tracheal pressure remains close to PEEP. Early prototype ventilators achieved true tracheal-pressure control and showed physiological and clinical benefits, but clinical studies with commercial systems have failed to confirm these earlier findings. A 2003 bench study found that commercial ventilators provided, at best, only partial tube compensation, unlikely to result in meaningful clinical benefit. We therefore tested whether this limitation has been remedied in contemporary ICU ventilators.

Methods: We performed a bench comparison of five commercial ICU ventilators and an ATC prototype ventilator designed to accurately compensate for the flow-dependent resistance over a wide range of flow rates. An active lung simulator generated spontaneous breathing patterns with weak, moderate, and strong inspiratory efforts at different PEEP levels. We tested each breathing pattern through endotracheal tubes with inner diameters of 7 and 8 mm, and measured airway pressure, tracheal pressure, and flow during CPAP with and without ATC. Breathing through the tube against open atmosphere served as a zero-PEEP/T-piece reference.

Results: In CPAP mode, the commercial ventilators showed flow-dependent airway-pressure deviations, amounting to a substantial added resistance of 1.5 - 6.5 mbar/(L/s), whereas the ATC prototype ventilator imposed an added resistance of only 0.6 mbar/(L/s). In ATC mode, the commercial ventilators reduced the resistive load by no more than by 25%, and large tracheal-pressure deviations remained, especially at higher inspiratory effort and during expiration. In some cases, the residual load during ATC was even greater than the load during unsupported breathing through the tube. By contrast, the ATC prototype ventilator maintained tracheal pressure close to PEEP throughout the breathing cycle and eliminated on average 79% of the tube-related resistive load.

Conclusions: In the commercial ventilators evaluated in this study, the defining physiological objective of ATC was only partially achieved. Therefore, clinical benefits previously reported for tracheal-pressure control support should be interpreted with caution when applied to commercial ATC implementations, unless effective tube compensation has been demonstrated under relevant conditions. These findings suggest that more advanced control approaches, such as those implemented in the ATC prototype ventilator, may be required to achieve consistent and physiologically accurate tube compensation.

Key words: patient-ventilator asynchrony; imposed work of breathing; closed-loop pressure control; demand-flow control

Introduction

The endotracheal tube is the largest resistive element of the respiratory system in most intubated patients [1]. During controlled mechanical ventilation, this resistance impedes airflow, prolongs expiration, and can cause dynamic hyperinflation and intrinsic PEEP [2, 3]. During ventilator-assisted spontaneous breathing, the endotracheal tube can dramatically increase the work of breathing [4] and promote patient-ventilator asynchrony (PVA) [5]. During strong inspiratory efforts, it can also cause large negative swings in tracheal and alveolar pressure [4] that have been implicated in patient self-inflicted lung injury [6]. The imposed tube resistive load can mimic weaning intolerance and delay extubation [7].

Automatic tube compensation (ATC) was developed to remove the artificial resistance of the endotracheal tube and prevent tube-related complications during mechanical ventilation [8]. The principle of ATC is straightforward: the ventilator continuously estimates the pressure drop across the endotracheal tube from the measured flow and the known pressure-flow characteristics of the tube. It then dynamically adds this pressure during inspiration and subtracts it during expiration, so that the tracheal pressure remains close to the set PEEP level at all times, regardless of the magnitude of inspiratory effort and flow [8]. Thus, ATC applies a variable, continuously flow-adapted positive airway pressure during inspiration and a variable sub-PEEP pressure during expiration. The physiological goal is to make the endotracheal tube mechanically “invisible” to the patient.

ATC can be provided either as a stand-alone mode or as an add-on feature to other modes such as patient-triggered pressure support or proportional assist ventilation. In the present study, we only consider ATC as a stand-alone mode, not its combination with other modes.

Early clinical studies with an ATC prototype ventilator established that the concept was physiologically sound and clinically beneficial. ATC compensated tube-related work of breathing in critically ill patients with high ventilatory demand, where conventional pressure support of 5, 10, or 15 mbar failed to do so [4]. Under ATC, the tracheal pressure remained close to PEEP even during strong respiratory efforts when the pressure loss across the tube pressure exceeded 25 mbar [4]. In a patient with severe patient-ventilator desynchronization under conventional, triggered inspiratory pressure support ventilation, the combination of ATC and proportional assist ventilation restored breath-by-breath support even at respiratory rates of more than 50 breaths per minute [9].

In 2003, a bench study compared the original ATC prototype with commercial ATC implementations [10], and found that commercial systems reduced the tube-related work of breathing by only 50-68% during inspiration, whereas the original ATC prototype achieved a reduction by 97%. During expiration, commercial systems achieved reductions of tube-related work by only 1-26%, whereas the original ATC prototype reduced it by 70%. The authors concluded that, unless these systems were improved, the advantages of commercial ATC over conventional patient-triggered pressure support would probably be negligible.

Here, we tested whether contemporary commercial ICU ventilators in ATC mode achieve the physiological goal of maintaining near-constant tracheal pressure during spontaneous breathing, independent of respiratory effort. We compared these contemporary commercial ventilators with previous-generation commercial ventilators and with an ATC prototype during simulated spontaneous breathing through endotracheal tubes of different sizes.

We found that commercial ventilators provided only a modest partial compensation of the tube resistance. The bulk of the resistive load remained, and in some cases ATC imposed a greater residual load than unsupported breathing through the tube against open atmosphere. By contrast, the ATC

prototype maintained tracheal pressure close to PEEP and largely eliminated the tube-related load, demonstrating that the shortcomings of commercial ventilators are technically solvable.

Methods

We tested the following ventilators, all of which offer Automatic Tube Compensation (ATC), also called Tube Resistance Compensation (TRC): Dräger Evita 4, Dräger Evita XL, Dräger Evita V600 (Drägerwerk AG, Lübeck, Germany), Hamilton C2, Hamilton C6 (Hamilton Medical AG, Bonaduz, Switzerland), and an ATC prototype ventilator. The original ATC prototype used in the clinical studies of the 1990s [4, 5, 8, 9] and in the 2003 technical comparison study [10] was no longer available. In this study, we used an ATC prototype based on the system described previously [8], with the following modifications. Positive and negative pressure were generated by two radial blowers (U65HN-024KS-6, Micronel, Switzerland), which were connected to the inspiratory and expiratory limbs of a Y-piece. Pressure was controlled by a three-way valve integrated directly into the Y-piece, as described in [11].

We tested tube-resistance compensation with original-length endotracheal tubes (Rüsch Super Safety Clear, Teleflex, Ireland) with inner diameters of 7 and 8 mm. Each tube was inserted into an artificial trachea made of polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA) and sealed airtight with the cuff. The artificial trachea had an inner diameter of 2.1 cm. Tracheal pressure was measured through 12 small radial holes equally spaced around the circumference of the artificial trachea and connected to a piezoresistive differential pressure sensor (Honeywell HCS series, USA; range ± 80 mbar). The tracheal pressure measurement site was located 60 mm distal to the tube tip and 50 mm proximal to the distal end of the artificial trachea, as described previously [1, 3].

On the proximal side, the endotracheal tube was connected to a swivel connector, a flexible tube, a thermal mass flow sensor (SFM3300, Sensirion, Switzerland), a short tube with a ring channel with eight small radial holes for airway pressure measurement, and the Y-piece of the ventilator under test. Airway pressure was measured with a piezoresistive differential pressure sensor (Honeywell HCS series, USA; range ± 80 mbar).

On the distal side, the artificial trachea was connected to a custom-built active lung simulator, as described in detail previously [3]. The simulator consisted of a 2.8 L piston pump connected to a 20 L glass container loosely filled with steel wool. A stepper-motor drive controlled the piston motion so that the simulator reproduced a prescribed airway resistance, respiratory-system elastance, and time-varying muscle pressure. The maximum response frequency of the active lung simulator was 25 Hz. The 20 L glass container acted as a compliance reservoir and prevented pressure and flow components above this frequency from encountering an effectively stiff simulator. This resulted in a minimum compliance of 20 ml/mbar, independent of the response bandwidth of the lung simulator.

We tested three different breathing patterns, corresponding to weak, moderate, and strong inspiratory efforts. For weak and moderate effort, airway resistance was set to 2 mbar/(L/s). Inspiratory time t_{in} was set to 1 s, and expiratory time to 2 s. The minimum inspiratory muscle pressure, $P_{mus,min}$, was set to -5 mbar for weak effort and -10 mbar for moderate effort. During inspiration, P_{mus} decreased monotonically from zero to $P_{mus,min}$ according to a quarter sine wave, $P_{mus}(t) = P_{mus,min} \sin[\pi t / (2 t_{in})]$, where t denotes the time after the onset of inspiration. During expiration, P_{mus} returned to zero within 0.5 s according to a half sine wave, $P_{mus}(t) = 0.5 P_{mus,min} [1 + \cos(\pi (t - t_{in}) / 0.5 \text{ s})]$. Total respiratory compliance was set to 100 ml/mbar for weak effort, and 50 ml/mbar for moderate effort. This lower compliance during moderate effort reflects the reduced chest-wall compliance that occurs during respiratory muscle activation. For simplicity, compliance was kept constant throughout the

breathing cycle and was not varied with instantaneous muscle activity. For strong inspiratory effort, the piston pump generated a sinusoidal volume pattern with a tidal volume of 1 L, an inspiratory time of 1 s, and an expiratory time of 1 s, independent of the resulting pressures and flows at the airway. Thus, no muscle pressure, airway resistance, or respiratory-system compliance was prescribed for this condition. The effective compliance was determined by the 20 L glass container and was approximately 20 ml/mbar, which corresponds to a stiff respiratory system during strong inspiratory effort.

We tested all ventilators both in CPAP and ATC modes. In CPAP mode, airway pressure should remain close to the set PEEP level throughout the breathing cycle, independent of respiratory effort and flow. To quantify the pressure-control performance of the tested ventilators, we computed the standard deviation of the airway pressure signal over the breathing cycle and normalized it by the standard deviation of flow, $R_{\text{eff,paw}} = \sigma(P_{\text{aw}}) / \sigma(\dot{V})$. This ratio has units of resistance and in CPAP mode quantifies the effective resistance proximal of the airway pressure measuring site, hence the resistance added by the ventilator circuit, demand-flow valve, and expiratory valve. Thus, $R_{\text{eff,paw}}$ is a pragmatic measure of pressure-control performance under dynamic conditions; it does not distinguish true resistive pressure losses from inertive, compliant, or control-transient contributions. Because it is based on standard deviations across the breathing cycle, it is insensitive to the absolute PEEP level, to the sign of pressure deviations from PEEP, and to the timing of these deviations within the breathing cycle.

In ATC mode, tracheal pressure should remain close to the set PEEP level. In the ventilator setup menu, we selected a tube diameter of 7 mm or 8 mm, depending on the inner diameter of the endotracheal tube used in each experiment. The compensation algorithms and resistance parameters used by the tested ventilators were not consistently disclosed by the manufacturers. For the Dräger Evita 4 and Evita XL ventilators, the manual specifies a purely quadratic tube model, $\Delta p_{\text{ETT}} = k_2 \text{sign}(\dot{V}) \dot{V}^2$ with tabulated k_2 values of 6.57 mbar/(L/s)² for an 8 mm tube and 10.56 mbar/(L/s)² for a 7 mm tube, according to [1]. For the other commercial ventilators tested here, however, the exact equations and tube-resistance parameters were, to our knowledge, not publicly disclosed. The equation for controlling ATC in the prototype ventilator was $\Delta p_{\text{ETT}} = k_1 \left(\frac{D_{\text{eff}}}{D_0} \right)^\beta \left(\frac{\dot{V}}{\dot{V}_0} + 4 \text{sign}(\dot{V}) \left(\frac{\dot{V}}{\dot{V}_0} \right)^2 \right)$, with $k_1 = 0.72$ mbar, $D_0 = 10$ mm, $\dot{V}_0 = 1$ L/s, and exponent $\beta = -3.6$ [3].

In ATC mode, we computed the effective resistance as $R_{\text{eff,ptrach}} = \sigma(P_{\text{trach}}) / \sigma(\dot{V})$, which quantifies the resistance proximal of the tracheal pressure measuring site, hence the residual resistive load that remains after tube compensation. $R_{\text{eff,ptrach}}$ includes contributions from the tube, swivel connector, flexible tube, flow sensor, ventilator circuit, demand-flow valve and expiratory valve.

The Dräger ventilators Evita 4 and Evita XL did not provide expiratory tube compensation. Therefore, we also computed an inspiration-only effective resistance according to $R_{\text{eff,ptrach,in}} = \text{mean}(|P_{\text{trach,in}} - \text{PEEP}|) / \text{mean}(|\dot{V}_{\text{in}}|)$. PEEP was defined as the end-expiratory tracheal pressure of the current breathing cycle.

All ventilators, breathing patterns, and tube diameters were tested at PEEP levels of 0, 5, and 10 mbar. Moderate and strong effort were also tested at 15 mbar PEEP. For each breathing pattern and tube diameter, we also measured $R_{\text{eff,ptrach}}$ during breathing against open atmosphere, with the ventilator disconnected. This condition corresponds to a zero-PEEP T-piece trial. In this case, $R_{\text{eff,ptrach}}$ reflects the effective resistance of the endotracheal tube, swivel connector, flexible tubing, and sensors, without the added resistance of the ventilator valves and breathing circuit, and without resistance reduction by tube compensation.

Results

We first tested airway-pressure control during CPAP. In this mode, airway pressure should remain close to the set PEEP throughout the breathing cycle. Instead, all commercial ventilators showed substantial flow-dependent deviations of airway pressure from PEEP (Fig. 1). These deviations increased with inspiratory effort and occurred during both inspiration and expiration. In the Hamilton ventilators, peak deviations exceeded 3 mbar under strong effort. Thus, even in CPAP mode, before tube compensation is considered, commercial ventilators behave as non-ideal pressure sources because of limitations in closed-loop pressure control and valve dynamics. By contrast, the ATC prototype ventilator controlled airway pressure close to the target and only exhibited noticeable deviations during transitions between inspiration and expiration.




Fig. 1: Airway pressure control during CPAP. Representative airway-pressure recordings (in mbar) during simulated spontaneous breathing through a 7 mm endotracheal tube at PEEP = 10 mbar. Columns show weak, moderate, and strong inspiratory effort. Rows show the tested ventilators. Airway pressure (blue) is plotted as deviation from the set PEEP level during two consecutive breathing cycles; the horizontal line marks zero deviation. In an ideal CPAP system, airway pressure would remain on this line throughout the breathing cycle. The dotted line shows $P_{mus} + PEEP$ and marks the timing of inspiration and expiration. The P_{mus} trace is truncated to keep the pressure deviations visible; the full, untruncated P_{mus} trace is shown in Fig. 3. Commercial ventilators showed substantial flow-dependent pressure deviations that increased with respiratory effort.

We quantified the effective resistance $R_{\text{eff,paw}}$ imposed by the ventilator during CPAP, and found values between approximately 1.5 and 6.5 mbar/(L/s) for the commercial ventilators (Fig. 2). Because $R_{\text{eff,paw}}$ normalizes pressure deviations by flow, the larger pressure deviations at stronger respiratory effort did not translate into a higher effective resistance. Across most commercial ventilators, $R_{\text{eff,paw}}$ was larger at zero PEEP than at higher PEEP levels. This PEEP dependence was particularly pronounced in the Hamilton C6. By contrast, the effective resistance imposed by the ATC prototype ventilator remained below 0.6 mbar/(L/s) and showed no systematic PEEP dependence.





Fig. 2: Effective airway resistance during CPAP. Effective airway resistance, $R_{\text{eff,paw}}$, during CPAP with a 7 mm endotracheal tube. Values are shown for weak, moderate, and strong inspiratory effort and for different PEEP levels and ventilators. $R_{\text{eff,paw}}$, during breathing in the “open” configuration, i.e. with the Y-piece removed and open to atmosphere, is zero by definition and not shown here.

Next, we tested tracheal-pressure control during Automatic Tube Compensation. In this mode, tracheal pressure should remain close to the set PEEP throughout the breathing cycle. Accordingly, airway pressure should increase above PEEP during inspiration and decrease below PEEP during expiration. This expected behavior was observed with the ATC prototype ventilator (Fig. 3). By contrast, all commercial ventilators showed substantial flow-dependent deviations of tracheal pressure from PEEP. These deviations increased with inspiratory effort and occurred during both inspiration and expiration. The Evita 4 and Evita XL ventilators did not offer expiratory tube compensation; accordingly, airway pressure did not decrease below PEEP during expiration. However, both ventilators maintained nearly constant tracheal pressure during inspiration at weak and moderate effort. The Hamilton C6 did not lower airway pressure below PEEP during expiration, even though expiratory tube compensation was activated. Taken together, the commercial ventilators did not maintain constant tracheal pressure throughout the breathing cycle as intended in ATC mode, either by design, as in the Evita 4 and Evita XL, or because tube compensation was insufficient.



Next, we quantified the residual effective resistance $R_{\text{eff},\text{ptrach}}$ during ATC. The ATC prototype ventilator showed values below 2 mbar/(L/s), without a pronounced dependence on inspiratory effort or PEEP (Fig. 4). By contrast, the commercial ventilators showed $R_{\text{eff},\text{ptrach}}$ values between approximately 4 and 13 mbar/(L/s) for a 7 mm tube, and between 3.5 and 11.5 mbar/(L/s) for an 8 mm tube. $R_{\text{eff},\text{ptrach}}$ increased markedly with stronger inspiratory effort. In the Evita V600 and the two Hamilton

ventilators, $R_{\text{eff,ptrach}}$ was higher at zero PEEP than at higher PEEP levels, consistent with the inability of these ventilators to lower airway pressure below atmospheric pressure during expiration and therefore to compensate expiratory tube resistance at zero PEEP. The effective resistance during breathing against open atmosphere was not substantially higher than during ATC with any of the commercial ventilators. In some cases, commercial ATC imposed an even larger effective resistance than unsupported breathing through the tube.

Averaged for all conditions, PEEP levels, and tube diameters, the Evita 4 in ATC mode compensated 22% of the effective tube resistance measured during unsupported breathing, the Evita XL compensated 25%, and the Evita V600 compensated 16%. With the Hamilton C2 and C6 the effective resistance even increased by 9% and 24% relative to the effective tube resistance measured during unsupported breathing. Taken together, the commercial ventilators did not provide an effective tube-resistance compensation throughout the breathing cycle. By comparison, the ATC prototype ventilator compensated 79% of the effective tube resistance.




Fig. 4: Effective tracheal resistance during ATC. Effective tracheal resistance, $R_{\text{eff,ptrach}}$, during ATC with a 7 mm (top) or 8 mm (bottom) endotracheal tube, shown for weak, moderate, and strong inspiratory effort, different PEEP levels, and all tested ventilators. The “open” condition shows the effective resistance during breathing against open atmosphere with the ventilator disconnected, equivalent to a zero-PEEP T-piece trial. In an ideal ATC system, $R_{\text{eff,ptrach}}$ should approach zero.

If the tracheal pressure is only measured during the inspiratory phase (defined here as the phase with positive flow, regardless of muscle effort), the two models Evita 4 and Evita XL kept the effective

tracheal resistance at around or below 2 mbar/(L/s) for weak and moderate effort (Fig. SI 1). For strong effort, all three Evita ventilators kept the effective tracheal resistance at around 4-6 mbar/(L/s) (Fig. SI 1). Averaged across all conditions, PEEP levels, and tube diameters, the Evita 4 compensated 64% of the effective inspiratory resistance measured during unsupported breathing, the Evita XL compensated 68%, the Evita V600 compensated 36%. In the tested setting, the Hamilton C2 provided no substantial inspiratory compensation, while the inspiratory resistance relative to unsupported breathing increased by 4% with the Hamilton C6. By contrast, the ATC prototype ventilator compensated 86% of the tube resistance during inspiration.

Both Hamilton ventilators require the placement of a variable-orifice flow sensor near the patient. In the main measurement configuration, we placed this sensor between the Y-piece and our airway-pressure adapter. This configuration made the measurements comparable across ventilators and ensured that our recorded airway and tracheal pressures were not affected by the added resistance of the Hamilton flow sensor, which was approximately 1 mbar/(L/s). However, our own flow sensor and airway-pressure adapter also imposed a small flow resistance. If the Hamilton flow sensor was placed distal to our flow sensor and pressure adapter, the ventilator can compensate this additional resistance in its airway-pressure control. We therefore repeated the measurements with this alternative configuration. We found that $R_{\text{eff,ptrach}}$ did not differ compared to the standard measurement configuration, except during the strong-effort pattern, where $R_{\text{eff,ptrach}}$ decreased by approximately 0.5 mbar/(L/s). This decrease reflects the added resistance of our flow sensor and pressure adapter at high flow (Fig. SI 2).

Discussion

Our data show that in the commercial ventilators investigated here, the effective resistance during ATC remained large and comparable to the resistive load observed during unsupported breathing through the tube (plus swivel connector, flexible tube, and flow sensor) against open atmosphere corresponding to the conditions of a zero-PEEP T-piece trial. Thus, the implementation of ATC in these ventilators did not correspond to the clinical mode label, and the ventilators did not deliver the complete mechanical unloading that clinicians may expect when selecting this mode.

A substantial part of the incomplete tube compensation appears to result from limitations in airway pressure control. In CPAP mode, all tested commercial ventilators showed substantial deviations of airway pressure from the target pressure. These deviations were particularly large in the two Hamilton ventilators and corresponded to an effective resistance from the ventilator alone of more than 3 mbar/(L/s). Together with incomplete tube compensation, the combined resistive load from the ventilator and the uncompensated tube resistance reached, on average, more than 4 mbar/(L/s) at weak inspiratory effort, approximately 6 mbar/(L/s) at moderate effort, and approximately 8 mbar/(L/s) at strong effort for the three Dräger ventilators. In the two Hamilton ventilators, the effective resistance was about 2 mbar/(L/s) higher still, exceeding 10 mbar/(L/s) at high respiratory demand. Thus, the highest residual loads occurred under the condition in which mechanical unloading matters most for the patient. For comparison, taking the resistance of an N95 facemask (approximately 0.5 mbar/(L/s) [12]) as a reference, the residual load in ATC mode would correspond to the resistance encountered when breathing through roughly 12–20 facemasks stacked together.

Clinical studies of commercial ATC implementations have mainly examined its role during spontaneous breathing trials, with mixed results: several studies found no clear reduction in weaning duration or mechanical ventilation time compared with CPAP or low pressure support [13-15], whereas a meta-analysis suggested that ATC may improve extubation success compared with other spontaneous breathing trial modes [16]. None of these clinical studies, however, investigated whether commercial

ventilators actually compensated endotracheal tube resistance as originally intended. By the same token, any clinical benefits attributed to ATC in early studies with a fully operational prototype ventilator cannot be extrapolated to commercial implementations unless those devices demonstrate effective tracheal-pressure control.

The reasons for the limited tracheal-pressure control observed in the commercial ventilators remain unclear. However, the performance of the ATC prototype ventilator demonstrates that effective tracheal-pressure control is technically feasible. In addition, the Evita 4 and Evita XL ventilators showed a reasonable tube compensation during inspiration (SI Fig. 1). Their large effective resistance during ATC (Fig. 4) was mainly attributable to the complete absence of expiratory tube compensation.

True expiratory tube compensation requires the ventilator to lower airway pressure below PEEP and, at low PEEP, sometimes below atmospheric pressure. Both the original ATC prototype and the current ATC prototype were able to do so. This capability requires additional safety precautions, because valve failure could expose the patient to harmful negative airway pressures. It is therefore understandable that manufacturers have avoided active subatmospheric pressure control. However, all three contemporary ventilators tested here offered expiratory tube compensation at higher PEEP levels, where subatmospheric pressure was not required. Even under these conditions, only the Evita V600 lowered airway pressure appreciably below PEEP.

We noticed that tube compensation improved when the ventilators were set to a smaller than the actual tube diameter. This observation suggests that tube compensation may have been intentionally incomplete, possibly to avoid overcompensation or unstable pressure control. In clinical practice, however, endotracheal tube resistance is often higher than that of a clean tube because of mucus deposition, biofilm formation, or kinking [17, 18]. Selecting a smaller tube diameter may therefore appear tempting, but we discourage this strategy unless tube obstruction has been measured and translated into an effective tube diameter. A method to estimate this effective diameter *in situ* has recently been presented [19].

Since we tested only a small number of contemporary ventilators from two manufacturers, our findings cannot be generalized to all ICU ventilators currently on the market. Nonetheless, our findings highlight the importance of demonstrating effective tube compensation for individual ventilator implementations. Until such evidence is available, extrapolation of the clinical benefits observed with true tracheal-pressure control to commercial ATC implementations should be undertaken with caution. At the same time, the performance of the ATC prototype ventilator demonstrates that effective tube compensation is technically feasible.

Declarations:

Author approval: All authors have seen and approved the manuscript.

Ethics approval and consent to participate: This study did not involve human participants, data, or identifiable images.

Consent for publication: Not applicable. This study did not involve human participants, data, or identifiable images.

Availability of data and materials: The raw data and analysis software can be obtained from the corresponding author upon request.

Competing interests: BF and CK are the inventors of a pending patent application (PCT/EP2023/074318; WO2024052339A1) related to the ATC prototype ventilator described. RF declares no competing interests.

Funding: This study was not funded by specific project grants.

Author Contributions: BF designed the study, CK designed and built the active lung simulator, BF and CK designed and built the prototype ventilator, BF performed the experiments and analyzed the data, BF and RF wrote the manuscript.

Acknowledgements: We thank Christoph Gründler and Alexander Rentrop for providing ventilators for testing, and for helpful discussions.

References

1. Guttman J, Eberhard L, Fabry B, Bertschmann W, Wolff G: **Continuous calculation of intratracheal pressure in tracheally intubated patients.** *Anesthesiology* 1993, **79**(3):503-513. doi:10.1097/00000542-199309000-00014.
2. Guttman J, Eberhard L, Fabry B, Bertschmann W, Zeravik J, Adolph M, Eckart J, Wolff G: **Time constant/volume relationship of passive expiration in mechanically ventilated ARDS patients.** *Eur Respir J* 1995, **8**(1):114-120. doi:10.1183/09031936.95.08010114.
3. Fabry B, Bonakdar N, Kuster C, Bartl J, Krischke F, Francis R: **Prediction and prevention of ventilation impairments during bronchoscopy.** *Intensive Care Med Exp* 2025, **13**(1):130. doi:10.1186/s40635-025-00846-5.
4. Fabry B, Haberthur C, Zappe D, Guttman J, Kuhlen R, Stocker R: **Breathing pattern and additional work of breathing in spontaneously breathing patients with different ventilatory demands during inspiratory pressure support and automatic tube compensation.** *Intensive Care Med* 1997, **23**(5):545-552. doi:10.1007/s001340050371.
5. Fabry B, Guttman J, Eberhard L, Bauer T, Haberthur C, Wolff G: **An analysis of desynchronization between the spontaneously breathing patient and ventilator during inspiratory pressure support.** *Chest* 1995, **107**(5):1387-1394. doi:10.1378/chest.107.5.1387.
6. Brochard L, Slutsky A, Pesenti A: **Mechanical Ventilation to Minimize Progression of Lung Injury in Acute Respiratory Failure.** *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2017, **195**(4):438-442. doi:10.1164/rccm.201605-1081CP.
7. Kirton OC, DeHaven CB, Morgan JP, Windsor J, Civetta JM: **Elevated imposed work of breathing masquerading as ventilator weaning intolerance.** *Chest* 1995, **108**(4):1021-1025. doi:10.1378/chest.108.4.1021.
8. Fabry B, Guttman J, Eberhard L, Wolff G: **Automatic compensation of endotracheal tube resistance in spontaneously breathing patients.** *Technol Health Care* 1994, **1**(4):281-291. doi:10.3233/THC-1994-1405.
9. Fabry B, Guttman J, Eberhard L, Wolff G: **Treatment of patient-ventilator desynchronization with automatic tube compensation (ATC) and proportional assist ventilation.** *Int Care Med* 1994, **20**(Suppl. 2):38.
10. Elsasser S, Guttman J, Stocker R, Mols G, Priebe HJ, Haberthur C: **Accuracy of automatic tube compensation in new-generation mechanical ventilators.** *Crit Care Med* 2003, **31**(11):2619-2626. doi:10.1097/01.CCM.0000094224.78718.2A.
11. Author: **Ventilator and method for controlling a Ventilator.** WO2024052339A1. <https://patentscopewipoint/search/en/detailsf?docId=WO2024052339>. World Intellectual Property Organization. 2024.
12. Roberge RJ, Kim JH, Powell JB, Shaffer RE, Ylitalo CM, Sebastian JM: **Impact of low filter resistances on subjective and physiological responses to filtering facepiece respirators.** *PLoS One* 2013, **8**(12):e84901. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0084901.
13. Cohen JD, Shapiro M, Grozovski E, Lev S, Fisher H, Singer P: **Extubation outcome following a spontaneous breathing trial with automatic tube compensation versus continuous positive airway pressure.** *Crit Care Med* 2006, **34**(3):682-686. doi:10.1097/01.CCM.0000201888.32663.6A.
14. Guerin C, Terzi N, Mezidi M, Baboi L, Chebib N, Yonis H, Argaud L, Heunks L, Louis B: **Low-pressure support vs automatic tube compensation during spontaneous breathing trial for weaning.** *Ann Intensive Care* 2019, **9**(1):137. doi:10.1186/s13613-019-0611-y.

15. Figueroa-Casas JB, Montoya R, Arzabala A, Connery SM: **Comparison between automatic tube compensation and continuous positive airway pressure during spontaneous breathing trials.** *Respir Care* 2010, **55**(5):549-554.
16. Cardinal-Fernandez P, Bougnaud J, Cour M, Argaud L, Poole D, Guerin C: **Automatic Tube Compensation During Spontaneous Breathing Trials.** *Respir Care* 2022, **67**(10):1335-1342. doi:10.4187/respcare.09920.
17. Wright PE, Marini JJ, Bernard GR: **In vitro versus in vivo comparison of endotracheal tube airflow resistance.** *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1989, **140**(1):10-16. doi:10.1164/ajrccm/140.1.10.
18. Wilson AM, Gray DM, Thomas JG: **Increases in endotracheal tube resistance are unpredictable relative to duration of intubation.** *Chest* 2009, **136**(4):1006-1013. doi:10.1378/chest.08-1938.
19. Fabry B, Kuster C, Francis R: **Continuous monitoring of endotracheal tube obstructions using naturally occurring pressure and flow oscillations.** *medRxiv* 2026. doi:10.64898/2026.05.01.26352226.

Supplementary information




Fig. SI 1: Effective tracheal resistance during ATC during inspiration. Effective tracheal resistance $R_{eff,ptrach,in}$ in inspiration (positive flow) during ATC with a 7 mm (top) and 8 mm (bottom) endotracheal tube, shown for weak, moderate, and strong inspiratory effort, different PEEP levels, and all tested ventilators. $R_{eff,ptrach,in}$ is computed during the positive flow phase as the mean absolute difference between the tracheal pressure and PEEP, divided by the mean inspiratory flow. PEEP is the end-expiratory tracheal pressure of the current breathing cycle, measured as the mean tracheal pressure between 80 ms and 40 ms before the start of the next inspiration.




Fig. SI 2: Effect of flow sensor placement on effective tracheal resistance. In the standard measurement configuration, the thermal mass flow sensor and airway pressure adapter are placed between the flexible tube and the Y-piece. The Hamilton C2 (and C6) ventilators provide their own flow sensor and airway pressure adapter, which is placed between the Y-piece and our airway pressure adapter. This corresponds to the standard measurement configuration, in which the resistance of our thermal mass flow sensor and airway pressure adapter is not compensated by the demand-flow control of the ventilator and thus adds to the total resistance of the respiratory system. However, by placing the Hamilton flow and pressure sensor adapter between the flexible tube and our thermal mass flow sensor and airway pressure adapter, the resistance of the latter can be compensated by the ventilator. Comparison of effective tracheal resistance without flow sensor resistance compensation (left bars) and with flow sensor resistance compensation (right bars) shows only negligible effects, except at strong respiratory effort where flow sensor resistance compensation lowers $R_{eff,ptach}$ by up to 0.5 mbar/(L/s).