

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/165089>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

Modeling mechanical ventilation *in silico* – potential and pitfalls

Authors: David M. Hannon BSc MB BCh BAO FCAI^{1#}, Sonal Mistry BEng^{2#}, Anup Das MEng PhD², Sina Saffaran MEng PhD³, John G. Laffey BSc MB Bch BAO MA MD FFARCSI, Bindi S. Brook BSc PhD⁴, Jonathan G. Hardman BMedSci BM BS FRCA DM^{5,6}, and Declan G. Bates BEng PhD^{2*}

Affiliations:

1. Anesthesia and Intensive Care Medicine, School of Medicine, NUI Galway, Ireland.
2. School of Engineering, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK.
3. Faculty of Engineering Science, University College London, London, WC1E 6BT, UK.
4. School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2UH, UK.
5. Anesthesia & Critical Care, Injury Inflammation and Recovery Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2UH, UK.
6. Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham NG7 2UH, UK.

#Equal contributions, *Corresponding author

Abstract

Computer simulation offers a fresh approach to traditional medical research that is particularly well suited to investigating issues related to mechanical ventilation. Patients receiving mechanical ventilation are routinely monitored in great detail, providing extensive high-quality data-streams for model design and configuration. Models based on such data can incorporate very complex system dynamics that can be validated against patient responses for

use as investigational surrogates. Crucially, simulation offers the potential to “look inside” the patient, allowing unimpeded access to all variables of interest. In contrast to trials on both animal models and human patients, *in silico* models are completely configurable and reproducible; for example, different ventilator settings can be applied to an identical virtual patient, or the same settings applied to different patients, in order to understand their mode of action and quantitatively compare their effectiveness. Here, we review progress on the mathematical modeling and computer simulation of human anatomy, physiology, and pathophysiology in the context of mechanical ventilation, with an emphasis on the clinical applications of this approach in various disease states. We present new results highlighting the link between model complexity and predictive capability, using data on the responses of individual patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome to changes in multiple ventilator settings. The current limitations and potential of *in silico* modeling are discussed from a clinical perspective, and future challenges and research directions highlighted.

Keywords Mechanical ventilation, Mathematical modeling, Computer simulation

Introduction

“All models are wrong, some are useful” – George Box¹

A model can be most generally defined as any simplified version of reality² resulting in a representation of real-life form and function³. Models can take many forms – physical, conceptual, verbal, mathematical, etc. – and they are often implicitly used in standard medical research; for example, studies that examine a relationship between surrogate and clinical outcomes rely on an underlying model that relates the two. For the purposes of this article, a ‘model’ will refer to a mathematical or geometric description of physiological processes and anatomic organisation⁴.

A detailed discussion of the possible approaches to developing and implementing mathematical models is beyond the scope of this article, but in the most general sense, two different approaches can be taken². The first, often described as a ‘black box’ approach, derives a quantitative description of a physiological system based solely on data (typically inputs applied to the system and outputs collected from measurements). These data-driven models are generally most appropriate where there is a lack of knowledge concerning the underlying physiology. The second approach, which we focus on here, involves mechanistically modeling the system by explicitly describing the underlying physiology using mathematical equations⁵. A major advantage of this approach is that the resulting model can provide mechanistic insights⁶ into why, and how, a particular intervention or treatment can provide benefit⁷.

Seeking to gain new understanding of a system as complex as the respiratory system using traditional experimental approaches is extremely challenging⁸. An ideal approach would allow for the simplification of some confounding heterogeneity, whilst retaining an ability to monitor clinically meaningful outcomes, or their surrogate markers. Mathematical models that can be implemented on computers to produce virtual replicas of individual patients⁹ could provide an important new tool for clinical research, allowing the possibility of rapid hypothesis testing¹⁰, without any ethical or patient-safety concerns.

However, the respiratory system represents a substantial challenge for physiological modeling, due to its inherent complexity, and to the continuing difficulty in “looking inside” the lung. During the process of breathing, there are numerous mechanical and physical forces acting on the organ system at several levels of complexity and resolution¹¹. The earliest attempts at a simple mathematical description of the respiratory system are over 70 years old^{12,13}. The earliest *in silico* implementations of respiratory system models on digital computers date to over 50 years ago^{14,15} and work in this area has continued to expand in

scope and complexity^{16,17}, with recent efforts focusing on developing highly integrated representations of the respiratory and cardiovascular systems¹⁸⁻²⁰. Although the term *in silico* is not rigorously defined, it can be placed within the context in which experimentation and research into the human body take place within a triad of *in vivo* (within or utilizing the living organism), *in vitro* (outside the organism), or *in silico* (using computer simulations)²¹. Thus, *in silico* refers to the use of computer software to simulate, monitor, and experiment with physiological processes for the purposes of medical research.

***In silico* modeling in the context of mechanical ventilation**

Mechanical ventilation (MV) is used extensively in critical illness, and recent epidemiological work has indicated that the incidence of MV for non-surgical reasons in the United States was over 300 persons per million of the adult population²². The need for MV increased dramatically beyond this level during the Covid-19 pandemic²³. One challenge in conducting research among critically ill patients receiving mechanical ventilation is the heterogeneous nature and severity of their pathologies. Whether due to the syndromic nature of critical illness²⁴, or the interaction between therapy and context within an individual patient²⁵, the results and meaning of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are often unclear²⁶. Relatively few RCTs into novel mechanical ventilation strategies have shown beneficial impact of the intervention on the survival of patients²⁷. Many methodological problems compound research in this setting, and the majority of important achievements that have improved mortality are the results of improvements in recognizing deteriorations in patients and avoiding iatrogenic harm²⁸.

A significant body of research exists in which various approaches have been applied to modeling the geometry and physiological behavior of the respiratory system under

mechanical ventilation, especially within the engineering literature^{13,29}. The precise details of these approaches vary widely in terms of approach and complexity, and results exhibit varying degrees of clinical relevance. In the following, we focus on work which has demonstrated direct clinical applicability and insight, identifying key themes and areas of relevance.

Acute respiratory distress syndrome

One of the most important areas for the clinical application of MV is for respiratory support in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), which affects around 10% of patients admitted to Intensive Care Units (ICU), and 25% of patients who require MV³⁰. *In silico* modeling has yielded important insights into several areas relating to the pathophysiology and ventilatory management of this condition.

Modeling ARDS pathophysiology

There have been several attempts to accurately model key pathophysiology involved in ARDS. One successful approach has resulted in the ability to recreate not just the behavior of the respiratory system under mechanical ventilation but also interactions with the cardiovascular system, in order to successfully replicate individual patients with ARDS³¹. A contrasting, more simplified, approach is the development and validation of a physiologically relevant respiratory model that captures compliance and resistance within a single compartment lung model³². Another study utilized a hybrid approach combining computational modeling with real-time electrical impedance tomography to predict global and local ventilatory quantities for a given patient with ARDS³³. Another model investigated the effect of severe injury on how compliance changes with more severe injury, giving mechanistic insight into how the ‘volume history’ of the injured lung affects the tendency for

de-recruitment in ARDS³⁴. Other integrated models of cardiopulmonary physiology have been developed, but focus was on their ability to replicate and respond to hypoxia and hypercapnia data in healthy patients, rather than the ability to simulate individual ARDS patients¹⁹. Computational fluid dynamics (CFD) has also been a promising approach to simulate pulmonary pathophysiology^{35,36}.

Diagnosing ARDS

The utility of modeling to assist with the diagnosis of ARDS has also been examined. It is known that ARDS is under-recognized based on standard diagnostic criteria³⁰, and recent expert opinion has added to the debate around whether the current diagnostic criteria for ARDS is indeed sufficient to encompass such a heterogeneous range of pathophysiology³⁷. One study found that using a simple ARDS model led to reclassification of disease in approximately 30% of cases³⁸. There is clearly a large potential for *in silico* modeling to contribute to deeper phenotypic and mechanistic insight in this complex and heterogeneous condition.

Optimizing mechanical ventilation

Research into optimization of MV in ARDS has been a particularly fruitful area for *in silico* modeling. This includes insight into the titration of positive end expiratory pressure (PEEP), the avoidance of ventilator induced lung injury (VILI), evaluation of recruitment maneuvers, and the calculation and integration of patient factors (such as spontaneous breathing effort and age) when considering MV settings.

The titration of PEEP is traditionally performed using standardized protocols based on previous RCTs³⁹, often incorporating a mix of clinician experience. Mathematical modeling has yielded important insights regarding the optimization of PEEP. For example, modeling work in which optimal PEEP was determined using a detailed interrogation of elastance

suggested that PEEP was often set at a level below the optimum for patients⁴⁰. In contrast with this, the potential for an inappropriately high PEEP to paradoxically lead to decreased oxygen delivery to tissues has also been elucidated using modeling⁴¹. Detailed models have also been developed that can predict mechanical responses to altered PEEP⁴², and a desktop application named CURE Soft has been developed which can be used for real-time optimization of MV (in particular PEEP)⁴³. A single center RCT comparing the use of this system compared with standard therapy is currently underway⁴⁴.

VILI refers to the phenomenon whereby lung tissue can be injured when the ventilator delivers breaths that are too large (volutrauma), pressures that are too great (barotrauma), or repeated cycles of alveolar collapse and reopening (atelectasis). The primary goal of MV is now recognized as managing the balance between achieving effective oxygenation of the patient while avoiding VILI in heterogeneous, injured lung tissue⁴⁵. It is not possible to measure the occurrence of VILI directly, but surrogate markers such as the driving pressure and mechanical power delivered to the lung, and thresholds of elastance have been proposed. Modeling has provided insights into the mechanistic basis of RCT-derived associations between VILI indicators such as driving pressure and mortality⁴⁶, and allowed different VILI indicators to be compared in terms of their suitability as “targets” for maximally protective ventilation⁴⁷. Stochastic modeling has been used to create patient-specific models to predict future elastance ranges for a patient, yielding a range for minute volume that will be minimize VILI⁴⁸, though further clinical testing is needed to verify this approach. The problem of minimizing VILI while adequately oxygenating a patient can be framed as an ‘optimization problem’, in which values known to represent harm are given to the computational model as clear boundaries within which a solution representing safe ventilation is found. Using this approach, it is indeed possible to simulate individual patient physiology and determine safe limits^{29,49}. *In silico* modeling has also been used to examine

the molecular level changes that take place during the poorly understood mechanisms that underlie VILI⁵⁰, opening up the possibility for new avenues to treatment and prevention.

Recruitment maneuvers (RMs), in which various ventilation protocols are used to re-inflate lung tissue that has collapsed (or has become ‘derecruited’) constitutes another important area for the application of modeling in ARDS research, with much debate still surrounding best clinical practice in this area⁵¹. *In silico* work has allowed direct quantitative comparisons of RMs on the virtual patients with differing severities of ARDS, suggesting that patients with severe ARDS are likely to gain greater benefit from RMs than patients with mild or moderate disease⁵², indicating that short-term protective changes in cardiac output may be warranted pre-emptively, and identifying thresholds of PEEP to achieve and sustain recruitment⁵³. Other studies have predicted lung mechanics during RMs in volume and pressure control modes^{54,55}, suggesting that RMs can behave unpredictably due to multiple stability states within the injured lung⁵⁶, and showing how titration of airway pressures based on variations in intra-tidal mechanics may mitigate processes associated with injury due to derecruitment⁵⁷. Airway network models has allowed the examination of stresses within different portions of lung tissue, identifying areas most at risk of injury during RMs⁵⁸.

Another important aspect of optimizing MV in ARDS involves taking account of patient specific factors and how they can alter what constitutes ideal therapy. For example, a detailed model of the geometry of the respiratory system has been designed to reflect known changes consistent with ageing⁵⁹. Simulation of respiratory mechanics and lung function under different ageing conditions outlined the dynamic deterioration of lung function due to ageing, illustrating the importance of taking account of the effects of ageing when subjecting older patients to MV. Considering the spontaneous effort of breathing that can be executed by the ventilated patient is another critical issue in ensuring protective ventilation. Simulations using a ‘Gaussian Effort Model’ have been used successfully to illuminate the interactions between

a ventilator and the breathing patient⁶⁰. Taking into account patient resistance and elastance with each breath has also been shown to be possible, improving the estimation of respiratory mechanics, providing clinicians with measurements that can assist therapeutic optimisation⁶¹. Other work in this area has shown clear potential to improve fully and partially assisted modes of MV^{62,63}.

In silico modeling offers a safe environment in which to compare the effects and potential of novel and different modes of ventilation. For example, work has shown that moderately high-frequency ventilation could allow safe reduction of tidal volumes and airway pressures in ARDS patients⁶⁴, but also illustrates mechanisms by which injury can be induced when these frequencies become too high and interact with innate physical properties of lung tissue⁶⁵.

Pediatric and neonatal mechanical ventilation

Research into the use of modeling to investigate mechanical ventilation strategies in pediatric and neonatal ARDS patients is significantly less well advanced than in adults. A simple simulator that can represent pediatric patients was presented in⁶⁶, but this model has not yet been validated against patient data and is restricted to patients greater than 7 years old. A detailed simulator of cardiopulmonary ARDS pathophysiology has been adapted to match data from a large cohort of pediatric ARDS patients aged between 1 month and 18 years of age⁶⁷, and was used to analyze potential strategies for achieving more protective ventilation⁴⁷.

The extremely small volumes of neonates' lungs, as well as their large respiratory and vascular resistances make simulating the neonatal respiratory system challenging.

Physiological features such as lung volume, cardiac output, oxygen consumption and airway resistance are weight-dependent in neonates, and some parameters such as pulmonary vascular resistance are highly variable during the first hours of life. Initial work on the development of the first simulator for mechanically ventilated neonates was presented in⁶⁸.

Weaning from mechanical ventilation

The way in which ARDS patients are weaned from MV is increasingly being recognized as a crucial part of their treatment. Research seems to support the use of standardized protocols, but the heterogeneity of patients within some studies highlights the need for caution when considering any particular example⁶⁹, and multiple meta-analyses of the conduct of spontaneous breathing trials (SBTs) show that neither the use of a method involving a T-piece or Pressure Support demonstrates a clear benefit^{70,71}.

This marks an important area where *in silico* simulation may be able to offer insight. A single-center RCT is currently underway in which a model-based decision support tool will be used to guide weaning compared to standard care (the iCareWean trial). The system used is based on a set of physiological models including models of pulmonary gas exchange, acid–base chemistry, lung mechanics and respiratory drive⁷².

COVID-19 ARDS

The debate about apparent phenotypes of Covid-19 patients during the global pandemic offered an opportunity for *in silico* testing to investigate the pathophysiology of this disease. This work involved adapting a previously validated computational simulator of standard ARDS to develop quantitative insights into the key pathophysiologic differences between the COVID-19 ARDS against conventional ARDS, and to assess the impact of different PEEP, fraction of inhaled oxygen (FiO_2), and tidal volume settings⁷³. This work found that introducing disruption of alveolar gas-exchange due to the effects of pneumonitis and increased microthrombi-related vascular resistance, produced levels of ventilation perfusion mismatch and hypoxemia consistent with data from COVID-19 ARDS patients. In addition, the model suggested that the use of standard PEEP/ FiO_2 tables³⁹ and high PEEP strategies could be harmful in some early-stage COVID-19 ARDS patients.

In response to equipment shortages, many institutions explored the development of a shared ventilation strategy in which a single ventilator could be used to ventilate multiple patients simultaneously⁷⁴. Given the enormous ethical complexity involved in testing or implementing such an approach, *in silico* testing offered an ideal environment in which to explore the approach. A group was able to use simulation in order to provide proof-of-concept for an algorithm to better match patients in different hypothetical scenarios of a single shared ventilator using ARDSNet protocols and analysis of lung mechanics⁷⁵.

Other mechanical ventilation contexts

MV is employed in a variety of other contexts, many of which are amenable to research using mathematical modeling. Research has shown that the pathophysiology of mechanically ventilated patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) can be simulated with accuracy and indeed replicas of individual patients can be created using optimization algorithms and high-performance computation⁷⁶. Using this approach, mechanical ventilator settings that successfully managed the trade-off between ensuring adequate gas exchange and minimizing the risk of VILI for COPD patients were investigated. A different large-scale collaborative project is also seeking to address the complexity involved in accurately modeling the multiscale challenges associated with obstructive pathologies such as asthma and COPD⁸.

An innovative use for mathematical modeling has been in the realm of simulating mechanical ventilation strategies for patients with injury to the lung secondary to explosive blast forces. Primary blast lung injury (PBLI) caused by exposure to high-intensity pressure waves is associated with injury to parenchymal tissue and marked ventilation-perfusion mismatch. A mathematical model of PBLI was used to examine how the heterogeneity of resultant

damaged tissue affects gas flow and forces within the parenchyma⁷⁷. Another study has been able to accurately simulate the pathophysiology involved in PBLI⁷⁸, and used this approach to test different mechanical ventilation strategies, concluding that airway pressure release ventilation (APRV) represented a potentially useful approach in this patient group⁷⁹.

Other work has used integrated cardiopulmonary modeling to assess how therapies that mechanically support the cardiovascular system interact with mechanical ventilation, and the implications of these interactions. One study analyzed the effect of the interaction between mechanical ventilation and cardiac output when a biventricular pacemaker is used, and gives insight into the clinical implications of this interaction⁸⁰. Other work has explored the effects of similar interactions when an intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP) is used⁸¹.

Finally, models that incorporate virtual geometries derived from Computed Tomography (CT) images of patients have been used to investigate ‘noisy ventilation’, in which the patient receives variable tidal volumes, opening up the possibility of optimizing ventilation for patients who are not critically ill, but are being ventilated as an adjunct to other therapies such as surgical intervention⁸².

Education and training

Education to enable understanding of the principles and practice of safe mechanical ventilation is an important area for providers and professionals in training. Unfortunately, best principles and evidence-based practice are often not provided³⁰, for a variety of reasons⁸³. The potential for computational models to illustrate physiological principles and act as educational tools has been apparent for at least 50 years⁸⁴. *In silico* simulation offers an effective alternative to didactic and passive teaching strategies, as complex physiological simulations offer the chance to demonstrate the physiological response of a virtual patient, or

an isolated portion of their physiology, to a variety of interventions⁸⁵. This can be done rapidly, repeatedly, remotely, and at no risk to real patients. As such, it is unsurprising to see the increasing deployment of *in silico* models in this area⁸⁶. For example, a recent study proposed the use of a lumped parameter model, CARDIOSIM, for educational purposes⁸⁷ in which the system can demonstrate the physiology involved in mechanical ventilation⁸⁸ and simulate the interaction between mechanical ventilation and devices that support the functioning of the cardiovascular system⁸⁹. Systems that can illustrate the safe principles of mechanical ventilation have been proposed to help enable understanding of the effects of pre-existing disease on therapeutic management⁹⁰. Attempts have been made to create open online resources⁹¹, though not all these are functional⁹². One system that is functional and is in use in various contexts is the Pulse Physiology Engine, an open-source software application designed to enable accurate and consistent real-time simulations for improved medical training and clinical decision-making⁹³. Its open-source nature allows for ease of expansion⁹⁴ into many areas. This mathematical model can also be deployed in high fidelity manikins, and small trials comparing the use of manikins vs screen-based simulation have suggested the former approach produces superior outcomes⁹⁵.

Challenges for *in silico* modeling of mechanical ventilation

Despite the many innovations and potential applications of this approach, the integration of mathematical modeling, in all its various forms, into clinical practice still presents some serious challenges. Clearly, one of the main challenges moving forward is moving *in silico* modeling from a place where it can describe events to where it can inform interventions that shape events. At an institutional level, there exists a disconnect or unfamiliarity between

engineering-focused modelers and patient-facing clinicians, which can hinder the integration of complex models into clinical practice¹⁰.

The search for clinically meaningful outcomes is not straightforward, especially within the realm of critically ill patients, and traditional clinical research in the ICU environment is fraught with challenges. *In silico* modeling offers a potential way to sidestep some of these challenges and provide an alternative pathway to clinical innovation. However, the cornerstone and gold standard of evidence-based medicine remains the randomized control trial. This presents an apparent “Catch-22” situation, in which *in silico* modeling is used in order to work around inevitable challenges to performing RCTs, yet confirmation of the predictions of the *in silico* model in a RCT is ultimately necessary to convince clinicians of the benefit of the approach^{69,96}. One way to resolve this paradox is to conceptualize modeling as a tool for designing “better” (i.e., more likely to be successful) RCTs, via for example patient stratification in highly heterogeneous cohorts, rapid initial comparison of different potential interventions on *in silico* patient cohorts, “screening” and removal of interventions that are unlikely to be successful, etc.

An inescapable reality of any modeling approach is that some amount of simplification is involved in the representation of the underlying reality. This emphasizes the importance of asking models the right question in the right context, but also highlights a limitation; studies performed using mathematical and computational modeling cannot be configured to match real human subjects exactly^{97,98,99}. The challenge is therefore to find models which are *complex enough* to adequately describe and predict the pathophysiological aspects of the patient’s condition in which the clinician is interested. In the context of mechanical ventilation, a key requirement for clinically applicable models is obviously that they can accurately predict the effects of changing ventilator settings on the patient.

To illustrate the link between model complexity and predictive capability, we present here some new results validating the capability of the cardiopulmonary simulator described in previous publications^{18,31,41,46,47,52,53,64,100} to match and predict the responses of individual ARDS patients to changes in mechanical ventilator settings - see Figure 1 for a schematic of this model. Data previously collected from six mechanically ventilated patients (Draeger Evita, BiPAP) from the ICU at the Royal Hallamshire Hospital in the UK were used for this study³⁵. All the patients had a primary diagnosis of acute respiratory distress syndrome, characterized by reduced functional residual capacity, reduced arterial oxygen, and reduced lung compliance, and had no history of asthma or other chronic lung disorders. All patients were fully sedated, were stable on the ventilator, and were undergoing the standard invasive monitoring procedures for that ICU. Four ventilator parameters were available for changes: inspiratory pressure (P_{insp}), end expiratory pressure (PEEP), the ratio of inspiratory to expiratory time ($T_i:T_e$) and the fraction of inspired oxygen (F_{iO_2}). Ventilator settings were changed one at a time, and measurements of the patient's hemodynamic, respiratory and blood gas variables were taken before and after each change. This yielded a database of 26 pairs of data points (initial ventilator settings and patient measurements at time T_0 and subsequent ventilator settings and patient measurements at time T_1), collated from 6 patients – see Table 1.

To test the capability of the simulator to predict the patients' responses to changes in ventilator settings, for each pair of data points the simulator was first matched to the data at time T_0 , using advanced global optimization algorithms. In this process, ventilator settings in the simulator were fixed to match those recorded at T_0 . The optimization algorithm then tries to minimize the difference between the patient measurements made at T_0 and the corresponding outputs of the simulator. This is achieved by iteratively adjusting, within physiologically reasonable ranges, the following model parameters: extrinsic pressure,

alveolar stiffness, threshold opening pressures, pulmonary vascular resistance, and bronchial resistance, for each of the 100 independent alveolar compartments in the model, as well as values for respiratory quotient, oxygen consumption, hemoglobin concentration, volume of anatomical dead space, upper airway resistance, and anatomical shunt. Once the simulator parameters that give the closest match to the patient data at time T0 are found, all model parameters are fixed, and the relevant ventilator setting in the simulator is changed to that recorded in the data at time T1. Predicted values of PaO₂ and PaCO₂ produced by the simulator are then compared with those from the patient measurements made at time T1.

As shown in Table 1, for the vast majority of the 26 pairs of data points the simulator can both accurately match the patient data at time T0 and predict the patient's responses to the change in ventilator setting recorded at time T1, with low mean absolute percentage errors between simulator outputs and patient data being recorded for both PaO₂ and PaCO₂. To investigate the link between model complexity and predictive capability, we then repeated the matching process when the number of independent alveolar compartments in the model is reduced from 100 to 50, 25, and 10. The impact on the accuracy of the model's predictions is shown in Figure 2 – reducing the complexity of the model produces a steep reduction in its predictive capability. To quote a famous scientist, “It can scarcely be denied that the supreme goal of all theory is to make the irreducible basic elements as simple and as few as possible without having to surrender the adequate representation of a single datum of experience¹⁰¹.”

Future research directions

Sir Cyril Chantler stated that “Medicine used to be simple, ineffective and relatively safe. Now it is complex, effective and potentially dangerous”¹⁰². The intensive care environment is an especially notable example of a highly complex environment, wherein many systems

(from the cellular to the institutional) react and interact across multiple hierarchies. This complexity makes *in silico* approaches particularly useful to evaluate new treatment strategies, inform decision making, monitor responses, and aid training. In the context of mechanical ventilation, two distinct directions for future clinical applications can be identified – models to guide real-time decision support (or to assist in the development of fully automated) systems, and models for use as research tools.

In silico models for patient management

Currently, management of patients on mechanical ventilators is largely based on protocols derived from large-scale clinical trials, with ventilator settings periodically adjusted by clinicians whose workloads are increasingly unsustainable. Truly personalized treatment requires rapid and frequent interventions based on changes in the patient's state that are often not achievable within current ICU constraints – a recent study found that important targets for oxygen saturation in mechanically ventilated neonates were being achieved only 40% of the time¹⁰³. Computerized Decision Support Systems (DSS), or fully automated “closed-loop” ventilation systems, could potentially reduce clinician workload while providing patients with more rapid personalized interventions – *in silico* models will form the core of both.

Early proposals for decision support systems relied heavily on rule-based clinical heuristics^{104,105}, but more modern systems have begun to integrate *in silico* models to drive decisions^{72,98,106}. In a recent study, a DSS retrospectively evaluated treatment in 16 intensive care patient cases, with physiological models fitted to the retrospective data and then used to simulate patient response to changes in therapy¹⁰⁷. Compared to the baseline ventilator settings set as part of routine clinical care, the system suggested lower tidal volumes and inspired oxygen fraction, but higher frequency. Another study retrospectively examined the ability of a model driven DSS to advise on pressure support (PS) levels in a critically ill

patient. The system advised on low values of PS while acting to preserve respiratory muscle function and preventing passive lung inflation. It also minimized FIO₂ maintaining SpO₂ at safe and beneficial values¹⁰⁸. A protocol has recently been published for a multi-center RCT to compare mechanical ventilation in ARDS patients following use of this DSS to that of standard routine care, with the primary outcome defined as a reduction in driving pressure across all severities and phases of ARDS¹⁰⁹. A key requirement for the models employed in all such systems is the ability to run in real-time on standard low-cost computing platforms. Managing the trade-off between the resulting limitations on model complexity and its predictive capability will be a key challenge for future development of such systems. It also seems likely that such systems will increasingly be challenged by artificial intelligence-based algorithms leveraging large-scale data analytics rather than mechanistic models¹¹⁰.

Although both DSS and fully automated ventilator control systems have clear potential for improving the care of critically ill patients, an under-researched question concerns how they should be best deployed in the ICU environment. For example, should they be deployed using standalone “apps” that can even run on a standard tablet, or remotely access high-performance computing platforms via a bedside laptop, or be integrated into next-generation ventilators? A related question concerns how their outputs can be most effectively communicated to clinicians, to avoid generating yet more numbers in an already crowded sea of information, or more alarms or guidance notifications that risk being ignored in favor of familiarity.

In silico models as research tools

Within the realm of medical research, *in silico* models are now increasingly recognized as having huge potential to facilitate the difficult, time-consuming and costly work of designing large real-world RCTs in critical care²¹. The models available now let us create replicas of

real patients that have been proven to behave as expected, raising the interesting possibility of generating a ‘biobank’ of virtual patients who can be utilized for virtual trials. Data-only systems like this exist¹¹¹, although they are not tied to any specific model. Biobanks of *in silico* patients based on validated models¹⁰⁰ could radically improve the design of RCTs by allowing for more exact patient stratification, and providing initial results on the likely effects of novel treatments that could be used to optimize trial protocols and reduce the likelihood of negative outcomes. The potential for studies based on *in silico* models to inform treatment is also being increasingly recognized in areas of medicine where it is essentially impossible to carry out RCTs, such as emergency medicine and responses to mass casualty events¹¹².

Beyond the realm of RCTs, the use of *in silico* models in pre-clinical research into mechanical ventilation will continue to expand, as such models begin to match or surpass the clinical relevance of animal or *in vitro* models. An important factor to consider here is the inevitable continuous improvement in the fidelity and predictive capability of *in silico* models, as more and better data becomes available for model construction and validation, and as the availability of low-cost computing power continues to increase.

Acknowledgements

David M. Hannon has received support through the College of Anesthesiologists of Ireland (CAI) Research Fellowship 2021, funded by Abbvie. Declan G. Bates and Jonathan G.

Hardman acknowledge funding from Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) (EP/P023444/1 and EP/V014455/1).

References

1. Box GE. Science and statistics. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 1976;71(356):791-799
2. Cobelli C, Carson E. *Introduction to modeling in physiology and medicine*. Academic Press; 2019:
3. Harvey DJ, Hardman JG. Computational modelling of lung injury: is there potential for benefit? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2011;366(1562):300-305
4. Hahn CE, Farmery A. Gas exchange modelling: no more gills, please. *British journal of anaesthesia*. 2003;91(1):2-15
5. Colquitt RB, Colquhoun DA, Thiele RH. In silico modelling of physiologic systems. *Best practice & research Clinical anaesthesiology*. 2011;25(4):499-510
6. Major VJ, Chiew YS, Shaw GM, Chase JG. Biomedical engineer's guide to the clinical aspects of intensive care mechanical ventilation. *Biomedical engineering online*. 2018;17(1):1-31
7. Shafer SL, Varvel JR. Pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, and rational opioid selection. *Anesthesiology*. 1991;74(1):53-63
8. Burrowes KS, Doel T, Brightling C. Computational modeling of the obstructive lung diseases asthma and COPD. *J Transl Med*. Nov 28 2014;12 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S5
doi:10.1186/1479-5876-12-s2-s5

9. Chase J, Desai T, Preiser J-C. Virtual patients and virtual cohorts: a new way to think about the design and implementation of personalized ICU treatments. *Annual Update in Intensive Care and Emergency Medicine 2016*. Springer; 2016:435-448.
10. Dong Y, Chhatwal NW, Gupta A, Hadzikadic M, Gajic O. Systems modeling and simulation applications for critical care medicine. *Annals of intensive care*. 2012;2(1):1-10
11. Hall JE, Hall ME. Guyton and Hall textbook of medical physiology e-Book. Elsevier Health Sciences; 2020:
12. Gray JS. Pulmonary ventilation and its physiological regulation. Thomas; 1950:
13. Clark AR, Kumar H, Burrows K. Capturing complexity in pulmonary system modelling. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part H: Journal of Engineering in Medicine*. 2017;231(5):355-368
14. Horgan J, Lance R. Digital computer simulation of the human respiratory system. *Proceedings of the IEEE*. 1963;51(3):534-534
15. West JB. Ventilation-perfusion inequality and overall gas exchange in computer models of the lung. *Respir Physiol*. Jun 1969;7(1):88-110 doi:10.1016/0034-5687(69)90071-1
16. Rideout VC. Mathematical and computer modeling of physiological systems. Prentice Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ; 1991:
17. Rampadarath A, Donovan G. Mathematical modelling of lung function—what have we learnt and where to next? *Current Opinion in Physiology*. 2021;

18. Das A, Haque M, Chikhani M, et al. Development of an integrated model of cardiovascular and pulmonary physiology for the evaluation of mechanical ventilation strategies. *IEEE*; 2015:5319-5322
19. Cheng L, Albanese A, Ursino M, Chbat NW. An integrated mathematical model of the human cardiopulmonary system: model validation under hypercapnia and hypoxia. *American Journal of Physiology-Heart and Circulatory Physiology*. 2016;310(7):H922-H937
20. Albanese A, Cheng L, Ursino M, Chbat NW. An integrated mathematical model of the human cardiopulmonary system: model development. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol*. Apr 1 2016;310(7):H899-921 doi:10.1152/ajpheart.00230.2014
21. Pappalardo F, Russo G, Tshinanu FM, Viceconti M. In silico clinical trials: concepts and early adoptions. *Brief Bioinform*. Sep 27 2019;20(5):1699-1708 doi:10.1093/bib/bby043
22. Mehta AB, Syeda SN, Wiener RS, Walkey AJ. Epidemiological trends in invasive mechanical ventilation in the United States: a population-based study. *Journal of critical care*. 2015;30(6):1217-1221
23. Meyer NJ, Gattinoni L, Calfee CS. Acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Lancet*. Aug 14 2021;398(10300):622-637 doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(21)00439-6
24. Ranieri VM, Rubenfeld GD, Thompson BT, et al. Acute respiratory distress syndrome: the Berlin Definition. *Jama*. Jun 20 2012;307(23):2526-33 doi:10.1001/jama.2012.5669

25. Reade MC, Delaney A, Bailey MJ, et al. Prospective meta-analysis using individual patient data in intensive care medicine. *Intensive Care Medicine*. 2010/01/01 2010;36(1):11-21 doi:10.1007/s00134-009-1650-x
26. Iwashyna TJ, Burke JF, Sussman JB, Prescott HC, Hayward RA, Angus DC. Implications of heterogeneity of treatment effect for reporting and analysis of randomized trials in critical care. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine*. 2015;192(9):1045-1051
27. Ospina-Tascón GA, Büchele GL, Vincent JL. Multicenter, randomized, controlled trials evaluating mortality in intensive care: doomed to fail? *Crit Care Med*. Apr 2008;36(4):1311-22 doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e318168ea3e
28. Latour-Pérez J. Clinical research in critical care. Difficulties and perspectives. *Medicina Intensiva (English Edition)*. 2018;42(3):184-195
29. Morton SE, Knopp JL, Chase JG, et al. Optimising mechanical ventilation through model-based methods and automation. *Annual Reviews in Control*. 2019;48:369-382
30. Bellani G, Laffey JG, Pham T, 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
31. Das A, Haque M, Chikhani M, Wenfei W, Hardman JG, Bates DG. Creating virtual ARDS patients. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc*. Aug 2016;2016:2729-2732 doi:10.1109/embc.2016.7591294

32. Morton SE, Dickson J, Chase JG, et al. A virtual patient model for mechanical ventilation. *Computer methods and programs in biomedicine*. 2018;165:77-87
33. Roth CJ, Becher T, Frerichs I, Weiler N, Wall WA. Coupling of EIT with computational lung modeling for predicting patient-specific ventilatory responses. *J Appl Physiol* (1985). Apr 1 2017;122(4):855-867 doi:10.1152/jappphysiol.00236.2016
34. Bates JHT, Irvin CG. Time dependence of recruitment and derecruitment in the lung: A theoretical model. Article. *Journal of Applied Physiology*. 2002;93(2):705-713 doi:10.1152/jappphysiol.01274.2001
35. Wilson AJ, Murphy CM, Brook BS, Breen D, Miles AW, Tilley DG. A computer model of the artificially ventilated human respiratory system in adult intensive care. Article. *Medical Engineering and Physics*. 2009;31(9):1118-1133 doi:10.1016/j.medengphy.2009.07.009
36. Wall WA, Rabczuk T. Fluid–structure interaction in lower airways of CT-based lung geometries. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids*. 2008;57(5):653-675
37. Gattinoni L, Marini JJ. Isn't it time to abandon ARDS? The COVID-19 lesson. *Crit Care*. Sep 6 2021;25(1):326 doi:10.1186/s13054-021-03748-6
38. Karbing DS, Kjaergaard S, Smith BW, et al. Variation in the PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio with FiO₂: mathematical and experimental description, and clinical relevance. *Crit Care*. 2007;11(6):R118 doi:10.1186/cc6174
39. Brower RG, Matthay MA, Morris A, Schoenfeld D, Thompson BT, Wheeler A. Ventilation with lower tidal volumes as compared with traditional tidal volumes for acute

lung injury and the acute respiratory distress syndrome. *N Engl J Med*. May 4 2000;342(18):1301-8 doi:10.1056/nejm200005043421801

40. Chiew YS, Chase JG, Shaw GM, Sundaresan A, Desai T. Model-based PEEP optimisation in mechanical ventilation. *BioMedical Engineering OnLine*. 2011/12/23 2011;10(1):111 doi:10.1186/1475-925X-10-111

41. Chikhani M, Das A, Haque M, Wang W, Bates D, Hardman J. High PEEP in acute respiratory distress syndrome: quantitative evaluation between improved arterial oxygenation and decreased oxygen delivery. *BJA: British Journal of Anaesthesia*. 2016;117(5):650-658

42. Sun Q, Zhou C, Chase JG. Parameter updating of a patient-specific lung mechanics model for optimising mechanical ventilation. *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*. 2020;60:102003

43. Szlavec A, Chiew YS, Redmond D, et al. The Clinical Utilisation of Respiratory Elastance Software (CURE Soft): a bedside software for real-time respiratory mechanics monitoring and mechanical ventilation management. *Biomed Eng Online*. Sep 30 2014;13:140 doi:10.1186/1475-925x-13-140

44. Kim KT, Morton S, Howe S, et al. Model-based PEEP titration versus standard practice in mechanical ventilation: a randomised controlled trial. *Trials*. Feb 1 2020;21(1):130 doi:10.1186/s13063-019-4035-7

45. Pham T, Brochard LJ, Slutsky AS. Mechanical Ventilation: State of the Art. *Mayo Clin Proc*. Sep 2017;92(9):1382-1400 doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2017.05.004

46. Das A, Camporota L, Hardman JG, Bates DG. What links ventilator driving pressure with survival in the acute respiratory distress syndrome? A computational study. Article. *Respiratory Research*. 2019;20(1)doi:10.1186/s12931-019-0990-5
47. Saffaran S, Das A, Laffey JG, Hardman JG, Yehya N, Bates DG. Utility of Driving Pressure and Mechanical Power to Guide Protective Ventilator Settings in Two Cohorts of Adult and Pediatric Patients With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome: A Computational Investigation. *Crit Care Med*. Jul 2020;48(7):1001-1008
doi:10.1097/ccm.0000000000004372
48. Lee JWW, Chiew YS, Wang X, et al. Stochastic Modelling of Respiratory System Elastance for Mechanically Ventilated Respiratory Failure Patients. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*. 2021/08/25 2021;doi:10.1007/s10439-021-02854-4
49. Das A, Menon PP, Hardman JG, Bates DG. Optimization of mechanical ventilator settings for pulmonary disease states. Article. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*. 2013;60(6):1599-1607 doi:10.1109/TBME.2013.2239645
50. Reiss L, Fragoulis A, Siegl S, et al. Ventilator-induced lung injury induces a positive signalling feedback loop between Nrf2 and amphiregulin. *European Respiratory Journal*. 2014;44(Suppl 58):3430
51. Goligher EC, Hodgson CL, Adhikari NKJ, et al. Lung Recruitment Maneuvers for Adult Patients with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Ann Am Thorac Soc*. Oct 2017;14(Supplement_4):S304-s311
doi:10.1513/AnnalsATS.201704-340OT

52. Das A, Haque M, Chikhani M, et al. Hemodynamic effects of lung recruitment maneuvers in acute respiratory distress syndrome. Article. BMC Pulmonary Medicine. 2017;17(1)doi:10.1186/s12890-017-0369-7
53. Das A, Cole O, Chikhani M, et al. Evaluation of lung recruitment maneuvers in acute respiratory distress syndrome using computer simulation. Critical care. 2015;19(1):1-15
54. Morton SE, Knopp JL, Chase JG, et al. Predictive Virtual Patient Modelling of Mechanical Ventilation: Impact of Recruitment Function. Ann Biomed Eng. Jul 2019;47(7):1626-1641 doi:10.1007/s10439-019-02253-w
55. Morton SE, Knopp JL, Tawhai MH, et al. Prediction of lung mechanics throughout recruitment maneuvers in pressure-controlled ventilation. Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine. 2020;197:105696
56. Ma B, Bates JH. Modeling the complex dynamics of derecruitment in the lung. Annals of biomedical engineering. 2010;38(11):3466-3477
57. Amini R, Herrmann J, Kaczka DW. Intratidal Overdistention and Derecruitment in the Injured Lung: A Simulation Study. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng. Mar 2017;64(3):681-689 doi:10.1109/tbme.2016.2572678
58. Stewart PS, Jensen OE. Patterns of recruitment and injury in a heterogeneous airway network model. J R Soc Interface. Oct 6 2015;12(111):20150523 doi:10.1098/rsif.2015.0523
59. Kim J, Heise RL, Reynolds AM, Pidaparti RM. Aging effects on airflow dynamics and lung function in human bronchioles. PloS one. 2017;12(8):e0183654

60. Arunachalam GR, Chiew YS, Tan CP, Ralib AM, Nor MBM. Patient asynchrony modelling during controlled mechanical ventilation therapy. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed.* Jan 2020;183:105103 doi:10.1016/j.cmpb.2019.105103
61. Chiew YS, Pretty C, Docherty PD, et al. Time-varying respiratory system elastance: a physiological model for patients who are spontaneously breathing. *PloS one.* 2015;10(1):e0114847
62. Larraza S, Dey N, Karbing DS, et al. A mathematical model approach quantifying patients' response to changes in mechanical ventilation: evaluation in volume support. *Med Eng Phys.* Apr 2015;37(4):341-9 doi:10.1016/j.medengphy.2014.12.006
63. Larraza S, Dey N, Karbing DS, et al. A mathematical model approach quantifying patients' response to changes in mechanical ventilation: Evaluation in pressure support. *J Crit Care.* Oct 2015;30(5):1008-15 doi:10.1016/j.jcrc.2015.05.010
64. Wang W, Das A, Cole O, Chikhani M, Hardman JG, Bates DG. Computational simulation indicates that moderately high-frequency ventilation can allow safe reduction of tidal volumes and airway pressures in ARDS patients. *Intensive Care Med Exp.* Dec 2015;3(1):33 doi:10.1186/s40635-015-0068-8
65. Herrmann J, Lilitwat W, Tawhai MH, Kaczka DW. High-Frequency Oscillatory Ventilation and Ventilator-Induced Lung Injury: Size Does Matter. *Crit Care Med.* Jan 2020;48(1):e66-e73 doi:10.1097/ccm.0000000000004073
66. Flechelles O, Ho A, Hernert P, et al. Simulations for mechanical ventilation in children: review and future prospects. *Critical care research and practice.* 2013;2013

67. Saffaran S, Das A, Hardman JG, Yehya N, Bates DG. High-fidelity computational simulation to refine strategies for lung-protective ventilation in paediatric acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Intensive Care Med.* Jul 2019;45(7):1055-1057 doi:10.1007/s00134-019-05559-4
68. Saffaran S, Das A, Algarni S, et al. Computational Simulation of Mechanically Ventilated Neonatal Patients in the Intensive Care Unit. 2019:
69. Blackwood B, Alderdice F, Burns KE, Cardwell CR, Lavery G, O'Halloran P. Protocolized versus non-protocolized weaning for reducing the duration of mechanical ventilation in critically ill adult patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* May 12 2010;(5):Cd006904 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006904.pub2
70. Li Y, Li H, Zhang D. Comparison of T-piece and pressure support ventilation as spontaneous breathing trials in critically ill patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Care.* Feb 26 2020;24(1):67 doi:10.1186/s13054-020-2764-3
71. Ladeira MT, Vital FM, Andriolo RB, Andriolo BN, Atallah AN, Peccin MS. Pressure support versus T-tube for weaning from mechanical ventilation in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* May 27 2014;2014(5):Cd006056 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006056.pub2
72. Rees SE, Karbing DS. Determining the appropriate model complexity for patient-specific advice on mechanical ventilation. *Biomed Tech (Berl).* Apr 1 2017;62(2):183-198 doi:10.1515/bmt-2016-0061

73. Das A, Saffaran S, Chikhani M, et al. In Silico Modeling of Coronavirus Disease 2019 Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome: Pathophysiologic Insights and Potential Management Implications. *Critical care explorations*. 2020;2(9)
74. (SCCM) TSoCCM. Joint Statement on Multiple Patients Per Ventilator. Accessed 11/10/2021, 2021. <https://www.asahq.org/about-asa/newsroom/news-releases/2020/03/joint-statement-on-multiple-patients-per-ventilator>
75. Kheyfets VO, Lammers SR, Wagner J, Bartels K, Piccoli J, Smith BJ. PEEP/ FIO2 ARDSNet Scale Grouping of a Single Ventilator for Two Patients: Modeling Tidal Volume Response. *Respir Care*. Aug 2020;65(8):1094-1103 doi:10.4187/respcare.07931
76. Wang W, Das A, Ali T, et al. Can computer simulators accurately represent the pathophysiology of individual COPD patients? *Intensive Care Med Exp*. Dec 2014;2(1):23 doi:10.1186/s40635-014-0023-0
77. Herrmann J, Tawhai MH, Kaczka DW. Computational Modeling of Primary Blast Lung Injury: Implications for Ventilator Management. *Mil Med*. Mar 1 2019;184(Suppl 1):273-281 doi:10.1093/milmed/usy305
78. Haque M, Das A, Scott T, Bates D, Hardman JG. Primary blast lung injury simulator: a new computerised model. *BMJ Military Health*. 2019;165(1):45-50
79. Scott TE, Das A, Haque M, Bates DG, Hardman JG. Management of primary blast lung injury: a comparison of airway pressure release versus low tidal volume ventilation. *Article. Intensive Care Medicine Experimental*. 2020;8(1)doi:10.1186/s40635-020-00314-2

80. De Lazzari C, Del Prete E, Genuini I, Fedele F. In silico study of the haemodynamic effects induced by mechanical ventilation and biventricular pacemaker. Article. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*. 2013;110(3):519-527
doi:10.1016/j.cmpb.2013.02.010
81. De Lazzari C, De Lazzari B, Iacovoni A, et al. Intra-aortic balloon counterpulsation timing: A new numerical model for programming and training in the clinical environment. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed*. Oct 2020;194:105537 doi:10.1016/j.cmpb.2020.105537
82. Dincel E. Advanced mechanical ventilation modes: design and computer simulations. *Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Engin*. May 2021;24(6):673-686
doi:10.1080/10255842.2020.1845319
83. Wax RS, Kenny L, Burns P. Educating providers of mechanical ventilation: an update. *Curr Opin Crit Care*. Feb 2006;12(1):61-6 doi:10.1097/01.ccx.0000199807.85708.f7
84. Dickinson C. A digital computer model to teach and study gas transport and exchange between lungs, blood and tissues ('MacPuf'). *The Journal of physiology*. 1972;224(1):7P-9P
85. Singer BD, Corbridge TC, Schroedl CJ, et al. First-year residents outperform third-year residents after simulation-based education in critical care medicine. *Simul Healthc*. Apr 2013;8(2):67-71 doi:10.1097/SIH.0b013e31827744f2
86. Lino JA, Gomes GC, Sousa ND, et al. A Critical Review of Mechanical Ventilation Virtual Simulators: Is It Time to Use Them? *JMIR Med Educ*. Jun 14 2016;2(1):e8
doi:10.2196/mededu.5350

87. De Lazzari C, Genuini I, Pisanelli DM, D'Ambrosi A, Fedele F. Interactive simulator for e-Learning environments: A teaching software for health care professionals. Article. *BioMedical Engineering Online*. 2014;13(1)doi:10.1186/1475-925X-13-172
88. Marconi S, De Lazzari C. In silico study of airway/lung mechanics in normal human breathing. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*. 2020/11/01/ 2020;177:603-624
89. De Lazzari C, Genuini I, Quatember B, Fedele F. Mechanical ventilation and thoracic artificial lung assistance during mechanical circulatory support with PUCA pump: in silico study. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed*. Feb 2014;113(2):642-54
doi:10.1016/j.cmpb.2013.11.011
90. Serna LY, Hernandez AM, Mañanas MA. Computational tool for modeling and simulation of mechanically ventilated patients. *IEEE*; 2010:569-572
91. Takeuchi A, Abe T, Hirose M, Kamioka K, Hamada A, Ikeda N. Interactive simulation system for artificial ventilation on the internet: virtual ventilator. *J Clin Monit Comput*. Dec 2004;18(5-6):353-63 doi:10.1007/s10877-005-6268-0
92. Kitaoka H, Koc S, Tetsumoto S, Koumo S, Hirata H, Kijima T. 4D model generator of the human lung, "Lung4Cer". *IEEE*; 2013:453-456
93. Bray A, Webb JB, Enquobahrie A, et al. Pulse physiology engine: an open-source software platform for computational modeling of human medical simulation. *SN Comprehensive Clinical Medicine*. 2019;1(5):362-377
94. Webb JB, Bray A, Clipp RB. Parameterization of Respiratory Physiology and Pathophysiology for Real-Time Simulation. 2020:2274-2278

95. Spadaro S, Karbing DS, Fogagnolo A, et al. Simulation Training for Residents Focused on Mechanical Ventilation: A Randomized Trial Using Mannequin-Based Versus Computer-Based Simulation. *Simul Healthc*. Dec 2017;12(6):349-355
doi:10.1097/sih.0000000000000249
96. Vizcaychipi MP, Martins L, White JR, et al. Intensive Care Weaning (iCareWean) protocol on weaning from mechanical ventilation: a single-blinded multicentre randomised control trial comparing an open-loop decision support system and routine care, in the general intensive care unit. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(9):e042145 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042145
97. Laviola M, Bates DG, Hardman JG. Mathematical and Computational Modelling in Critical Illness. Editorial. *European Respiratory & Pulmonary Diseases*. 2017;5(1)
98. Rees SE. The Intelligent Ventilator (INVENT) project: The role of mathematical models in translating physiological knowledge into clinical practice. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*. 2011/12/01/ 2011;104:S1-S29 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2607\(11\)00307-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2607(11)00307-5)
99. Das A, Gao Z, Menon P, Hardman J, Bates D. A systems engineering approach to validation of a pulmonary physiology simulator for clinical applications. *Journal of the Royal Society interface*. 2011;8(54):44-55
100. Hardman JG, Bedforth NM, Ahmed AB, Mahajan RP, Aitkenhead AR. A physiology simulator: validation of its respiratory components and its ability to predict the patient's response to changes in mechanical ventilation. *Br J Anaesth*. Sep 1998;81(3):327-32
doi:10.1093/bja/81.3.327

101. Robinson A. Did Einstein really say that? *Nature*. 2018;557(30)(Books and Arts)
102. Chantler C. The role and education of doctors in the delivery of health care. *Lancet*. Apr 3 1999;353(9159):1178-81 doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(99)01075-2
103. Hagadorn JI, Furey AM, Nghiem T-H, et al. Achieved versus intended pulse oximeter saturation in infants born less than 28 weeks' gestation: the AVIOx study. *Pediatrics*. 2006;118(4):1574-1582
104. Tehrani FT, Roum JH. Intelligent decision support systems for mechanical ventilation. *Artif Intell Med*. Nov 2008;44(3):171-82 doi:10.1016/j.artmed.2008.07.006
105. Tehrani FT, Abbasi S. A model-based decision support system for critiquing mechanical ventilation treatments. *J Clin Monit Comput*. Jun 2012;26(3):207-15 doi:10.1007/s10877-012-9362-0
106. Rees SE, Allerød C, Murley D, et al. Using physiological models and decision theory for selecting appropriate ventilator settings. *Journal of Clinical Monitoring and Computing*. 2006/09/15 2006;20(6):421 doi:10.1007/s10877-006-9049-5
107. Karbing DS, Allerød C, Thomsen LP, et al. Retrospective evaluation of a decision support system for controlled mechanical ventilation. *Med Biol Eng Comput*. Jan 2012;50(1):43-51 doi:10.1007/s11517-011-0843-y
108. Spadaro S, Karbing DS, Dalla Corte F, et al. An open-loop, physiological model based decision support system can reduce pressure support while acting to preserve respiratory muscle function. *Journal of Critical Care*. 2018/12/01/ 2018;48:407-413 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2018.10.003>

109. Patel B, Mumby S, Johnson N, et al. Decision support system to evaluate VENTilation in the Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (DeVENT study) – Trial Protocol. medRxiv. 2021:2021.08.25.21262610 doi:10.1101/2021.08.25.21262610
110. Peine A, Hallawa A, Bickenbach J, et al. Development and validation of a reinforcement learning algorithm to dynamically optimize mechanical ventilation in critical care. NPJ digital medicine. 2021;4(1):1-12
111. Johnson AEW, Pollard TJ, Shen L, et al. MIMIC-III, a freely accessible critical care database. Scientific Data. 2016/05/24 2016;3(1):160035 doi:10.1038/sdata.2016.35
112. Mistry S, Das A, Hardman J, Bates D, Scott TE. Application of pre-hospital continuous positive airway pressure in hypovolaemic shock: A modelling study. British Journal of Anaesthesia, Special Issue on Mass Trauma Events. 2022 Feb;128(2):e151-e157. doi: 10.1016/j.bja.2021.10.012. Epub 2021 Dec 2.

Figure/Table captions

Figure 1. Diagrammatic representation of the ICSM cardiopulmonary simulator.

Figure 2. Average percentage error between 40 sets of patient data and corresponding simulator outputs for (A) PaO₂ and (B) PaCO₂ at time T₀ (matched) and T₁ (predicted) as the number of independent alveolar compartments in the model is varied.

Table 1. Simulated values of PaO₂ and PaCO₂ versus patient data for 26 pairs of ventilator settings and arterial blood gasses taken from 6 ARDS patients. Ventilator settings that were changed between times T₀ and T₁ are reported. The simulator was configured with the same ventilator settings as reported in the data at time T₀, and model parameters were matched to the corresponding patient measurements using global optimization algorithms. Ventilator settings were then changed in the simulator according to each set of patient data, and simulated values of PaO₂ and PaCO₂ are compared with new patient arterial blood gasses taken at time T₁. The absolute % error is the magnitude of the difference between the measured value and the simulated value, divided by the measured value, and then multiplied by 100.