Linking hyperoxia and harm: Consequence or merely Subsequence?
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Word count 1063
Humans are highly susceptible to interpreting the timing of events as evidence of causation. Absurd claims based on timing alone abound: Fifth-generation telecommunications networks and pandemics; measles, mumps, rubella immunization and autism; or homeopathy and efficacy. Many doctors are especially prone to this error. Samuel Johnson wrote “It is incident to physicians, ..., beyond all other men, to mistake subsequence for consequence.” (1)

Intensivists have more data to work with than most physicians. Hence, we may be uniquely prone to spot associations between abnormal physiological parameters and poor outcome. These can become seductive targets for ‘treatment’. But some such associations are the opposite of causal; they may be adaptive. No benefit, or even harm, is the result when normalisation of non-causal abnormalities are tested in large randomised clinical trials (RCTs). Familiar examples include: pyrexia during infection, low growth hormone, hyperglycemia, hypercarbia or moderate anaemia. (2)

With these warning-bells ringing, consider the association described in this issue of the Journal. Beshish and colleagues describe an association between hyperoxia on cardiopulmonary bypass (defined as an average bypass arterial oxygen tension of greater than 41.7KPa [313mmHg]) – and an increased risk of mortality. The effect size is dramatic: odds ratio = 4.3 (95% confidence interval [CI] 1.4–13.2, p=0.008), after adjustment for age, weight and STAT (Society of Thoracic Surgeons-European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery) mortality score. (3)

In an accompanying Statistical Note, Dr Horvat considers the techniques that may refine the probability of a causal inference (4). However outside of the statistical considerations the context of the observed association is relevant in determining the feasibility of a causal link.
The first relevant context is that similar associations have been made in other conditions. In 2011, hyperoxia was associated with poor outcomes post-cardiac arrest.(5) A U-shaped relationship exists between admission arterial oxygen tension and both crude and risk-adjusted mortality in unselected pediatric critical illness.(6) The most directly comparable data highlight poor outcomes with hyperoxia during support with extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO).(7)

Next, there are feasible and robust candidate mechanisms linking hyperoxia and harm. The simplest is that hyperoxia is a marker for overtreatment. Using too much pressure and oxygen increases the potential for ventilation-induced lung injury. Or maybe hyperoxia reflects a more generally inappropriate aggressive approach that is harmful via other mechanisms. While appealingly simple, this ‘hyperoxia as a marker of general overtreatment’ argument does not easily explain the association of death with hyperoxia on cardio-pulmonary bypass as described by Beshish and colleagues (3). Operative bypass is a decreet and shortlived exposure outside of the ICU. The next option is that a high oxygen tension is directly toxic to tissues. In excess, oxygen fuels increased ‘reactive oxygen species’ (ROS) formation. These oxygen-containing molecules hunt electrons avidly. Antioxidant molecules provide a partial buffer system that can neutralise a modest concentration of ROS. However, these can be overrun, leaving hungry ROS hunting electrons wherever they can find them. This state termed ‘oxidative stress’ is more precisely defined as “an imbalance between oxidant production and antioxidant and repair defences, resulting in increased steady-state levels of oxidized cellular macromolecules”.(8) Oxidation can disrupt all organic molecules (DNA, proteins, and lipids).(9) Enough oxidative damage causes cell death. Sub-lethal oxidative stress may trigger mitochondrial dysfunction-mediated organ ‘hibernation’ – one theory to explain multiple-organ failure. (10) This is a dynamic process. Recent work confirms that partial pressure of oxygen in an individual cell
influences the rate of ROS production as a by-product of oxidative phosphorylation in the mitochondria. The principle of manipulating inspired oxygen concentration to alter mitochondria ROS production may have merit. There is evidence of a benefit of hypoxia in models of congenital mitochondrial diseases. In short, the basic science context is consistent with hyperoxia causing harm.

Finally, and most importantly for the consideration of causation, there are data from RCTs that link more liberal oxygenation strategies with harm in multiple acute care settings. Liberal oxygenation was associated with a higher mortality than more conservative oxygenation (relative risk 1.21, 95% CI 1.03–1.43) in 16,037 adults across 25 RCTs in a range of acute diseases in adults: emergency surgery, myocardial infarction, sepsis and critical illness. Newer trials in adult critical care provide conflicting results though all have slightly different populations, interventions, comparators and outcomes. Hyperoxia appears to be harmful in sepsis whereas permissive hypoxia may be harmful in acute respiratory distress syndrome. No clear signal was apparent in the largest trial to date adult critical illness. There is evidence that lower pulse oximetry oxygen saturation (SpO2) targets (>90%) are safe may have some advantages in terms of rate of recovery in infants admitted to the ward with bronchiolitis. We are conducting the oxygenation targets in critically ill children (Oxy-PICU) trial in 15 centers, recruiting 2040 emergency paediatric intensive admissions receiving invasive mechanical respiratory support (ISRCTN92103439). We are randomising within 6 hours of eligibility to a more restrictive oxygen saturation SpO2 target (88-92%) or standard care (SpO2 >94%). This follows our pilot trial (n=120) with a similar protocol in which no safety concerns were identified. So, generally, trial data are consistent with systemic oxygenation being causally linked to outcome. The caveat is that the majority of trials focus on the benefits of mild hypoxia rather than harm from hyperoxia.
One phase II trial in progress for adults on ECMO, the “Blend to Limit oxygEN in ECMO” (NCT03841084), which will be directly relevant.

Even though the context is supportive for a causal link between hyperoxia and harm, two doubts remain. The possibility is that somehow hyperoxia on bypass reflects clinician and perfusionist concern in a way that is not captured in the adjustment for age, weight and STAT score – an ‘unmeasured confounder’. The other is the huge effect size with an odds ratio of 4.3 for death. If entirely causal this implies we could reduce death in the hyperoxia subgroup by ~80% just by turning down the oxygen flow rate on bypass. This is hardly credible. No intervention in intensive care has ever had an effect of this magnitude. It is both a source of excitement and a worry. We need to explore this urgently.

Psychologist Simon Baron-Cohen argues that the ‘systematizer’ (pattern recognition) trait is key in human creativity, inventiveness and progress. (18) Beshish and colleagues (3) have recognised a clear pattern in their data, which could lead to important progress. Now we need to try to reproduce the association in other populations and to hunt for unmeasured confounders. If the association persists, we must test causation formally in RCTs. In the meantime, we must resist the ‘consequence bias’. No-one should change oxygenation practice on this association alone.
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