

Title : ENFLURANE CONCENTRATION: INFLUENCE OF SEMICLOSED SYSTEM
 Authors : E. Goldman, M.D., T. de Campo, M.D., and J. A. Aldrete, M.D.
 Affiliation: Department of Anesthesiology, University of Colorado Medical Center,
 Denver, Colorado 80262

Introduction. While the anesthetic concentration delivered by the vaporizer and the actual inspired concentration are equal in an open anesthetic system, in a semiclosed system partial rebreathing with dilution of anesthetic gases can modify this relationship. Since the rate of rise of alveolar concentration (F_A) over inspired concentration (F_I) and the enflurane uptake (U_E) have been obtained using non-rebreathing high flow systems (1,2), we devised a protocol to determine, in a semiclosed system:

1. The correlation between the concentration of enflurane delivered by the vaporizer (F_{VAP}) and the actual inspired anesthetic concentration (F_I) using different flows.

2. The rate of rise of F_A/F_I and the decay in uptake as a function of time.

Methods. Fourteen patients ASA I-II scheduled for elective surgical procedures were included in this study. The concentration of anesthetic gas and the end-tidal CO_2 ($F_{ET}CO_2$) were measured with a double input mass spectrometer. One of the inputs was connected to the inspiratory limb of the circuit to determine F_I , and the other to a catheter located in the trachea to obtain end-tidal enflurane, considered equivalent to alveolar enflurane (F_A), and $F_{ET}CO_2$. The vaporizer used was a calibrated Vernitrol type. F_{VAP} was calculated from standard equations based on vapor pressure, barometric pressure, flow through vaporizer and total flow (F_{TOT}). U_E was calculated according to the following equation:

$$\dot{U}_E = (F_A/F_I - 1) \times F_I \times \dot{V}_A$$

Alveolar ventilation (\dot{V}_A) was calculated from $F_{ET}CO_2$. Data was evaluated using regression analysis, unpaired t-test and Mann-Whitney test.

Results. The difference between F_{VAP} and the actual F_I was flow dependent, fitting the following function

$$y = 7.3e^{-1.6x}$$

($r = -.70$, $p < .001$). With F_{TOT} as low as 1 L/min, $F_{VAP} - F_I$ was $0.79 \pm .53$; however, with F_{TOT} lower than 1 L/min the difference was 3.4 ± 2.9 ($p < .001$).

F_A/F_I and uptake were comparable with Torri's data.

$F_{ET}CO_2$ showed a negative correlation with F_A/F_I ($r = -0.62$; $p < 0.01$).

Time (min)	F_A/F_I	p	F_A/F_I^*	\dot{U}_E (ml/min)	\dot{U}_E^* (ml/min)
15	.74±.11	NS	.61±.02	30±24	30
30	.76±.05	NS	.67±.01	27±21	22
45	.78±.06	NS	.70±.02	22±16	18
60	.85±.02	<.05	.72±.02	15±7	17

* Data from Torri et al (1,2).

Values expressed as mean ± standard error.

Conclusions. In a semiclosed system with flows as low as one liter, F_{VAP} represents an adequate indication of the inhaled anesthetic concentration. However, if lower flows are administered the actual F_I cannot be estimated from F_{VAP} .

The U_E as well as the rate of rise of F_A in a semiclosed system, even with small flows, is comparable with available data obtained using higher flow and non-rebreathing techniques.

References

1. Torri G, Damia G, Fabiani ML et al: Uptake and elimination of enflurane in man. Brit J Anaesth 44:789-794, 1972.
2. Torri G: Uptake and elimination of enflurane at constant inspired and alveolar concentration. Acta Anaes Belg 25:190-197, 1974.