Contents lists available at ScienceDirect



## Journal of Clinical Anesthesia

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jclinane



# Effects of high versus low inspiratory oxygen fraction on postoperative clinical outcomes in patients undergoing surgery under general anesthesia: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Choon-Hak Lim<sup>a</sup>, Ju-young Han<sup>b</sup>, Seung-ha Cha<sup>c</sup>, Yun-Hee Kim<sup>d</sup>, Kyung-Yeon Yoo<sup>e</sup>, Hyun-Jung Kim<sup>t</sup>,

<sup>a</sup> Department of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine, College of Medicine, Korea University, Seoul, South Korea

<sup>b</sup> College of Medicine, Korea University, Seoul, South Korea

<sup>c</sup> Department of Radiology, Korea University Anam Hospital, Korea University Medical Center, Seoul, South Korea

<sup>d</sup> Department of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine, Hanyang University Hanmaeum Changwon Hospital, Changwon, South Korea

<sup>e</sup> Department of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine, Chonnam National University Medical School, Gwangju, South Korea

<sup>f</sup> Department of Preventive Medicine, College of Medicine, Korea University, Seoul, South Korea

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

<i>Keywords:</i> Atelectasis General anesthesia Inspiratory oxygen fraction Postoperative outcome Pneumonia	<i>Objectives:</i> To determine whether high perioperative inspired oxygen fraction (FiO <sub>2</sub> ) compared with low FiO <sub>2</sub> has more deleterious postoperative clinical outcomes in patients undergoing non-thoracic surgery under general anesthesia. <i>Design:</i> Meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. <i>Setting:</i> Operating room, postoperative recovery room and surgical ward. <i>Patients:</i> Surgical patients under general anesthesia. <i>Intervention:</i> High perioperative FiO <sub>2</sub> (≥0.8) vs. low FiO <sub>2</sub> (≤0.5). <i>Measurements:</i> The primary outcome was mortality within 30 days. Secondary outcomes were pulmonary out comes (atelectasis, pneumonia, respiratory failure, postoperative pulmonary complications [PPCs], and post operative oxygen parameters), intensive care unit (ICU) admissions, and length of hospital stay. A subgroup analysis was performed to explore the treatment effect by body mass index (BMI). <i>Main results:</i> Twenty-six trials with a total 4991 patients were studied. The mortality in the high FiO <sub>2</sub> group did not differ from that in the low FiO <sub>2</sub> group (risk ratio [RR] 0.91, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.42–1.97 P = 0.810). Nor were there any significant differences between the groups in such outcomes as pneumonia (RF 1.19, 95% CI 0.69–1.59, $P = 0.830$ ), ICU admission (RR 0.94, 95% CI 0.55–1.60, $P = 0.810$ ), and length of hospital stay (mean difference [MD] 0.27 d, 95% CI 1.02–0.216, $P < 0.001$ ). In subgroup analysis of BMI >30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> these parameters were similarly affected between the groups. <i>Conclusions:</i> The use of high FiO <sub>2</sub> compared to low FiO <sub>2</sub> did not affect the short-term mortality, although it may increase the incidence of atelectasis in adult, non-thoracic patients undergoing surgical procedures. Nor were there any significant differences in other secondary outcomes.
--	--

## 1. Introduction

Guidelines on the use of supplemental oxygen from the World Health Organization and from the US Centers for Disease Control have recommended the use of 0.8 fraction of inspiratory oxygen (FiO<sub>2</sub>) during the perioperative period to reduce or to prevent the risk of infection at the surgical site in adult patients undergoing general anesthesia [1,2]. Anesthesiologists indeed routinely administer high concentrations of

\* Corresponding author. E-mail address: moole02@naver.com (H.-J. Kim).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinane.2021.110461

Received 28 February 2021; Received in revised form 7 July 2021; Accepted 11 July 2021 Available online 11 September 2021 0952-8180/© 2021 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

oxygen during anesthetic induction and emergence from general anesthesia to prevent hypoxemia, especially in patients with difficult airway or in critically-ill patients [3,4].

However, there has been a debate on the safety of the perioperative use of high FiO2. One hundred percent oxygen, even in a short period of time, was associated with the formation of absorption atelectasis in 90% of anesthetized patients [5,6], resulting in reduced lung compliance, impaired oxygenation, and lung injury. It may worsen gas exchange when given before extubation [7]. A recent meta-analysis demonstrated that high FiO2 during anesthesia was associated with impaired postoperative oxygen parameters and increased severity of atelectasis [8]. The postoperative atelectasis has been noted as a risk factor to develop pulmonary complications, such as pneumonia leading to increased morbidity and mortality, and a prolonged hospital stay [9-11]. High FiO2 was related with major respiratory complications and increased 30day mortality in a retrospective study which analyzed 73,922 patients undergoing non-cardiothoracic surgery [12]. A liberal oxygen therapy increased mortality without improving other important clinical outcomes in acutely-ill adult patients [13].

On the contrary, a recent meta-analysis failed to note significant drawbacks such as mortality, intensive care unit (ICU) admission, pneumonia, and atelectasis following the use of high  $FiO_2$  in surgical patients undergoing general anesthesia [14]. An intervention-controlled trial with 5749 patients also found no deleterious effects on 30-day mortality and healing-related complications by the use of high  $FiO_2$  [15].

Most randomized controlled studies (RCTs) and meta-analyses of perioperative oxygen trials have focused on the prevention of surgical site infection or nausea and vomiting [15–22]. Little attention has been paid on diverse clinical events such as mortality, ICU admission, length of hospital stay, or clinically relevant pulmonary side-effects [14,23]. Moreover, most systematic reviews and meta-analyses included studies that used nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) in the inspiratory gas mixture [16,17,23–25]. N<sub>2</sub>O is known to increase the incidence of atelectasis and pneumonia, and to prolong the hospital stay [26,27]. Obesity may also affect the degree of atelectasis [28,29].

The present study was aimed at evaluating the effect of high  $FiO_2$  (80–100%) in patients who underwent non-thoracic surgery under general anesthesia with air as a carrier gas. The mortality was the primary outcome. Secondary outcomes included pulmonary events (atelectasis, pneumonia, respiratory failure, postoperative pulmonary complications [PPCs], postoperative oxygen parameters, and pulmonary function), ICU admissions, and length of hospital stay. A subgroup analysis was performed to explore the treatment effect by body mass index (BMI).

## 2. Materials and methods

The present study was registered at the International Prospective Registry of Systemic Reviews (CRD42020181140), and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) statement guidelines (Supplementary Table S1) [30].

#### 2.1. Data sources and searches

An information specialist was informed regarding previous systematic reviews and some RCTs related to postoperative pulmonary complications and clinical outcomes, and a search strategy was developed. The search strategy was applied to MEDLINE, EMBASE, and COCHRANE. A copy of the detailed search strategy is included in Supplementary Table S2. The last search was performed in April 2021. Reference lists in previous systematic reviews and related articles and ongoing studies from clinical trials (clinicalTrials.gov) were examined directly to avoid omissions in the initial search. Language and publication year restrictions were not applied.

#### 2.2. Study selection

Studies were eligible if they (1) were RCTs, (2) were performed in adult patients ( $\geq 18$  yr) undergoing general anesthesia for surgery, (3) had administration of high FiO<sub>2</sub> ( $\geq 80\%$ ) vs. low FiO<sub>2</sub> ( $\leq 50\%$ ) as defined by Koo et al. [8] during intervention period (i.e., induction, maintenance and emergence of anesthesia) and (4) reported relevant clinical outcomes such as mortality, pulmonary outcomes (atelectasis, pneumonia, respiratory failure, postoperative pulmonary complications [PPCs], postoperative oxygen parameters, and postoperative pulmonary function [i.e., the ratio of forced expiratory volume in one second to forced vital capacity [FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC]), ICU admission, length of hospital stay. Studies were excluded if they (1) comprised thoracic surgery, (2) used N<sub>2</sub>O as a carrier gas during general anesthesia, and (3) were subgroup analysis of an original RCT.

Two authors (J. H. and S. C.) independently screened titles and abstracts to look for relevant studies. The full-text of articles was finally evaluated to determine if they met the eligibility criteria. The uncertainties or conflicts in study selection were resolved through consultation with the first author (C.H.L.).

#### 2.3. Data extraction and quality assessment

Two authors (J. H. and S. C.) independently extracted data which were then checked for accuracy by the first author (C.H.L.). The unpublished data were collected through directly contacting the authors via e-mail. Mortality (in-hospital or within 30-days) was evaluated as the primary outcome. Secondary outcomes were pulmonary outcomes (atelectasis, pneumonia, respiratory failure and PPCs that occurred within the first 30 days following surgery [31], postoperative oxygen parameters and FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC within the first postoperative day), ICU admissions, and length of hospital stay.

The incidence of atelectasis was evaluated by using chest X-ray or computed tomography (CT) scan, and the severity was expressed as a percentage of extent of atelectasis surface to total lung surface with attenuation values between -100 and +100 Hounsfield units on CT scan. PPCs, a composite of postoperative pulmonary complications, was defined as the occurrence of three or more of the following signs (atelectasis, pneumonia, respiratory failure, pleural effusion, pneumothorax, bronchospasm, and aspiration pneumonitis) according to the criteria by ESA-ESICM joint taskforce on perioperative outcome measures [31]. Postoperative oxygen parameters were arterial partial oxygen pressure (PaO<sub>2</sub>), alveolar-arterial oxygen gradient (A-aDO<sub>2</sub>), and arterial oxygen saturation measure by pulse oximetry (SpO<sub>2</sub>).

Results reported in median and interquartile ranges were calculated to means and SDs using the methods of Wan et al. [32]. Results represented in forms of graph were extracted to mean and SD using GetData Graph Digitalizer v2.26.0.20 (S.Fedorov, GetData Graph Digitizer, http: //getdata-graph-digitizer.com). Risk of bias was analyzed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool (ROB v2.0). This has five domains (bias arising from the randomization process, bias due to deviations from intended interventions, bias caused by missing outcome data, bias in measuring outcome, and bias in selecting reported results) and an overall judgment. Each domain and the overall judgment classify the study as low, some concern, and high risk of bias. Two independent authors (J.H. and Y.H.K.) evaluated methodological quality and risk of bias. Any disagreement was discussed and adjusted by the first and corresponding authors (C.H.L. and H.J.K.). Publication bias was assessed using the funnel plot when at least 10 trials were available and the Egger test for continuous outcomes and Harbord test for binary test were used. In addition, quality of evidence for each outcome was assessed with the "Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation" (GRADE) [33].



Fig. 1. Flow chart of database search and study selection.

## 2.4. Data synthesis and analysis

Revman 5.3 software (Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, UK) and Stata version 15.0 (Stata Statistical Software, release 15; Stata Corp, College Station, TX, USA) were used for data synthesis and analysis. Depending on the reported effect size measures, pooled risk ratios (RR) or mean difference (MD), and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated. A random effects approach (inverse variance or Mantel-Haenszel) was chosen to allow for the expected heterogeneity across the studies: epidemiological and content knowledge suggested that data collected from various surgeries and different study designs would not meet the assumptions of the fixed-effects meta-analysis. The degree of heterogeneity among studies was based on I<sup>2</sup> statistics and the ranges of 0–50%, 50–75%, and 75–100% were regarded as low, moderate and high, respectively. Subgroup analysis was done to examine whether the treatment effect is affected by BMI  $>30~kg/m^2$ . Using sensitivity analyses, we also examined the effect of high FiO\_2 by the type of carrier gas (mentioned vs. not mentioned), time period of intervention during anesthesia (emergence vs. maintenance), and risk of bias (high vs. low and some concern) because of concerns related to their validity.

## 3. Results

Of 14,127 records that were initially screened, 52 full-text articles met the inclusion criteria. Twenty-six articles were then excluded: 6 used N<sub>2</sub>O in the inspired gas mixture, 4 had no related outcomes, and 9 were not RCTs. The studies performed under regional anesthesia (n = 1) or performed in patients less than 6 yr (n = 1) and an unfinished trial (n = 1) were also excluded. Four were subgroup analyses of one multicenter trial and thus were excluded due to data duplication (Fig. 1).

## Table 1

Characteristics of the studies included in the systemic reviews and meta-analysis.

Author	Year	RCT Design,	Patients	Respiratory status	Group	ASA	Intervention	Type of surgery	Outcomes (follow-up)
		Participants	characteristics		(FiO2)	state	Period		
		(n)							
Akca [39]	1999	Multi-center	18–65 yrs	No-pulmonary disease	High	I to III	M + E + PO	Elective colon	Incidence and severity of atelectasis
		30			(0.8) Low		2 n		(1 d) PaO2 and A-aDO2 (1 d), FEV1/FVC (1 d)
Belda [48]	2005	Multi-center	18–80 yrs	No-respiratory infection	(0.3) High	I to III	I + M + PO	Colorectal	Mortality (14 d), ICU admission,
		291			Low		011		10113
Benoit [40]	2002	Single-center	18–64 vrs.	No-pulmonary disease	(0.3) High (1)	I to II	Е	Extremities	Severity of atelectasis (immediate)
		20	$BMI < 30 \text{ kg/m}^2$		Low (0.4)				PaO2 (recovery)
Chen [43]	2013	Single-center	$\geq 18  \text{yrs}$	No-impairment of gaseous exchange	High (0.8)	I to IV	$\rm M+PO~24h$	Colorectal	Mortality (30 d), Pneumonia (30 d), LOHS
		60			Low				
Edmark [41]	2014	Single-center 59	30–85 yrs. BMI < 35 kg/m²	No-COPD	High (1) Low	I to III	Е	Orthopedic	Severity of atelectasis (immediate) SpO2 (emergence)
Eskandr [37]	2019	Single-center	20–60 yrs.	No-pulmonary disease	(0.3) High	I to II	M + E + PO	Laparoscopic	Incidence of atelectasis and FEV1/
		60	$BMI > 30 \ kg/m^2$		(0.9) Low (0.4)		211	cholecystectomy	PaO2 (2 h), SpO2 (recovery)
Ferrando [58]	2020	Multi-center	$\geq 18yrs$	No-ARDS, –pneumothorax	High (0.8)	I to III	M + PO  3  h	Abdominal	Mortality (30 d), PPCs (7 d), LOHS
		717	$BMI{<}35kg/m^2$	or -giant bullae	Low (0.3)				
Greif [35]	1999	Single-center	18–80 yrs	No-respiratory infection	High (0.8)	N/M	$M + PO \ 2 \ h$	Colon resection	SpO2 (1 d)
		231			Low (0.3)				
Greif [51]	2000	Multi-center	18–80 yrs	No-respiratory infection	High (0.8)	I to III	$\rm M + PO \ 2 \ h$	Open colorectal	Mortality (15 d), ICU admission, LOHS
		500			Low				
Joyce [55]	1995	Single-center	35–74 yrs	No-obstructive lung disease	(0.3) High (1)	N/M	M + E,	CABG with CPB	PaO <sub>2</sub> (1 d)
		30	$Weight{<}100kg$	or -respiratory disease	Low				
Kim [56]	2020	Single-center	20–70 yrs.	No-severe COPD, –emphysema	(0.3) High (1)	I to II	М,	Laparoscopic	Incidence of atelectasis (hospital stay)
		90	$BMI{<}35kg/m^2$	or -pneumothorax No-bullae or -previous	Low (04)			or colorectal	PPCs (hospital stay), LOHS
Kleinasser [42]	2014	Single-center 53	COPD	COPD	High (1) Low	N/M	Е	Carotid endarterectomy	PaO2 and A-aDO2 (1 h)
Korkulu [52]	2012	Single-center 50	19–76 yrs	No-pulmonary disease	(0.3) High (1) Low	I to II	М	Laparoscopic cholecystectomy	PaO2 and A-aDO2 (recovery)
Kotani [45]	2000	Single-center	$BMI{<}30kg/m^2$	No-respiratory infection,	(0.4) High (1)	I to II	$\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{E}$	Orthopedic	PaO2 (recovery), Incidence of
		60		-COPD or -restrictive pulmonary	Low				atelectasis (1 d)
Kurz [44]	2015	Multi-center	$\leq$ 80 yrs	disease No-respiratory infection,	(0.3) High	I to III	M + PO 1 h	Colorectal	Mortality (30 d), LOHS
		555		-severe COPD	(0.8) Low				
Li [59]	2020	Single-center	$\geq 18yrs$	No-acute lung injury or	(0.3) High	I to III	М	Abdominal	Mortality (30 d), LOHS, ICU
		251		-ARDS	(0.8) Low (0.3)				admission Incidence of atelectasis, Pneumonia, Respiratory failure and
Lim (p)* [36]	2005	Single-center 38	16–65 yrs	No-pulmonary disease	High (1) Low	I to II	E	Extremities	PPCs (7 d) PaO2 and A-aDO2 (30 min)
Lim (s)† [36]	2005	Single-center 40	16–65 yrs	No-pulmonary disease	(0.3) High (1) Low	I to II	E	Extremities	PaO2 and A-aDO2 (30 min)
Mackintosh	2012	Single-center	18–70 yrs	Preoperative	(0.3) High	N/M	М	General	SpO2 (recovery)
[50]		50	-	$SpO2 \ge 90\%$ or No-spontaneous	(0.9) Low				

(continued on next page)

Author Year		RCT Design,	Patients	Respiratory status	Group	ASA	Intervention	Type of surgery	Outcomes (follow-up)
		Participants (n)	characteristics		(FiO2)	state	Period		
Meyhoff [54]	2009	Multi-center	$\geq$ 18 yrs	Preoperative SpO2 $\geq$ 90%,	High (0.8)	I to III	$\rm M + PO \ 2 \ h$	Laparotomy	Mortality (30 d), ICU admission
		1386			Low (0.3)				Incidence of atelectasis, Respiratory failure and pneumonia (14 d)
Park [38]	2020	Single-center	18–79 yrs	No-pulmonary disease or	High (0.8)	I to III	Е	Laparoscopic colorectal	Incidence of atelectasis (2 d), SpO2 (recovery)
		46	$BMI < 30 \ \text{kg}/\text{m}^2$	-previous lung resection	Low (0.4)				
Renner [46]	2004	Single-center 64	18–65 yrs. BMI $<$ 30 kg/m $^2$	No smoking history	High (1) Low (0.3)	I to II	E	Peripheral musculoskeletal	PaO2 (1 h)
Shaefi [57]	2021	Single-center 100	$\geq$ 65 yrs		High (1) Low (0.35)	N/M	М,	CABG with CPB	Mortality (30 d), Pneumonia (30 d), LOHS
Staher [34]	2011	Single-center	$\geq \! 18  yrs$	Preoperative $SpO2 \ge 90\%$	High (0.8)	I to III	$\rm M + PO~2~h$	Laparotomy	Mortality (30 d), LOHS, ICU admission
		203	$BMI > 30 \ kg/m^2$		Low (0.3)				Incidence of atelectasis and pneumonia (14 d)
Stall [49]	2013	Single-center	$\geq 18~{ m yrs}$	No-respiratory infection, -COPD	High (0.8)	I to III	$M + PO \ 2 h$	Orthopedic	LOHS
		235		or preoperative $SpO2 \ge 90\%$	Low (0.3)				
Wansnik [53]	2015	Single-center		No-pulmonary disease	High (0.8)	N/M	M + PO 2 h	Appendectomy	LOHS
		64			Low (0.3)				
Zorembra [47]	2010	Single-center	BMI 25–35 kg/ m <sup>2</sup>	No-asthma	High (0.8)	I to III	М	Minor peripheral	SpO2 (2 h)
		142			Low (0.4)				

<sup>\*</sup> Propofol used as anesthetics; †sevoflurane used as anesthetics. A-aDO<sub>2</sub>: alveolar-arterial oxygen gradient; BMI: body mass index; CABG: coronary artery bypass graft; COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CPB: cardiopulmonary bypass; E: emergence; I: induction of anesthesia; ICU: intensive care unit; FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC: the ratio of the forced expiratory volume in 1 s to forced vital capacity; LOHS: length of hospital stay; M: maintenance of anesthesia; N/M: not mentioned; PaO<sub>2</sub>: arterial oxygen partial pressure; PO: postoperative; PPCs: postoperative pulmonary complications; RCT: randomized controlled trial; SpO<sub>2</sub>: arterial oxygen saturation by pulse oximetry.

However, a subgroup analysis of a multicenter trial was included in analyzing the patients with BMI greater than  $30 \text{ kg/m}^2$  [34]. A single center study in a multicenter trial was included because the results did not overlap [35]. One article had two studies [36]. Taken together, 4991 patients of 26 studies were included in the final analysis [34–59], whereof 2504 were assigned to the high FiO<sub>2</sub> group and 2487 to the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group. They are listed in Table 1.

## 3.1. Risk of bias

The results of risk of bias from each of the included studies based on the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool (ROB v2.0) are reported in Fig. 2 [60]. There was 92% consent between the raters for all items and there was no disagreements by more than the +/-1 level. The main contributor to high risk of bias was the randomization process with six trials. Fourteen trials presented a low risk of bias in all categories examined. The quality of evidence for each outcome was assessed with the "Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE)." Mortality was graded as a low level of evidence. Incidence of atelectasis (by chest radiography), respiratory failure, PaO<sub>2</sub>, A-aDO<sub>2</sub>, FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC, ICU admission, and length of hospital stay were graded as moderate level of evidence, incidence of atelectasis (by CT), pneumonia, and PPCs as low level of evidence (Table 2 and supplementary Table S3).

## 3.2. Primary outcome

#### 3.2.1. Mortality

Two studies were without records on deaths in either treatment arm,

Eight studies reported in-hospital or 30-day mortality of 3860 patients: 39/1935 patients died in the high FiO<sub>2</sub> group and 34/1925 patients in the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group, being the mortality not significantly different between the groups (RR, 0.91; 95% CI, 0.42–1.97, P = 0.810) (Fig. 3A). Heterogeneity between studies was low ( $I^2 = 30\%$ ).

#### 3.3. Secondary outcomes

#### 3.3.1. Pulmonary outcomes

3.3.1.1. Incidence of atelectasis. Seven studies with a total of 1948 patients used chest radiography and 2 studies with a total of 90 patients used chest CT scan to examine the atelectasis (Fig. 3Ba). High FiO<sub>2</sub> increased the incidence of atelectasis on chest radiography with a borderline significance (127/981 events in the high FiO<sub>2</sub> vs. 96/967 events in the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group; RR 1.27, 95% CI 1.00–1.62, P = 0.050). It also significantly increased the incidence of atelectasis on chest CT scans (38/46 events in the high FiO<sub>2</sub> vs. 27/44 events in the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group; RR 1.35, 95% CI 1.03–1.77, P = 0.030). Low heterogeneity was observed in both tools (I<sup>2</sup> = 0%, in both).

3.3.1.2. Severity of atelectasis. Three studies reported the severity of atelectasis using CT scans in a total of 109 patients. The area of atelectasis was larger in the high FiO<sub>2</sub> group than in the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group (MD 2.04%, 95% CI 0.14–3.94, P = 0.040) (Fig. 3Bb). A moderate level of heterogeneity was shown (I<sup>2</sup> = 68%).

3.3.1.3. Pneumonia. Four studies with a total of 1797 patients reported on pneumonia, whereof 76/890 events were observed in the high  $FiO_2$ 



**Fig. 2.** Assessment of quality by the Cochrane risk of bias tool. Red denotes high risk, yellow unclear risk and green low risk. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

group and 67/907 events in the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group, the incidence being not significantly different between the two groups (RR 1.19, 95% CI 0.74–1.92, P = 0.470) (Fig. 3Bc). A low heterogeneity was observed ( $I^2 = 33\%$ ).

*3.3.1.4. Respiratory failure.* Two studies with a total of 1637 patients reported on respiratory failure, whereof 40/811 events were observed in

the high FiO<sub>2</sub> group and 31/826 events in the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group. There was no significant difference in the incidence of respiratory failure between the groups (RR 1.29, 95% CI 0.82–2.04, P = 0.270) (Fig. 3 Bd). A low heterogeneity was observed ( $I^2 = 0\%$ ).

3.3.1.5. *PPCs.* Three studies of a total 1058 patients reported on PPCs with 108/534 events in the high FiO<sub>2</sub> group and 101/524 events in the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group, showing no significant difference in the incidence of PPCs between the groups (RR 1.05, 95% CI 0.69–1.59, P = 0.830) (Fig. 3Be). A moderate heterogeneity was observed ( $I^2 = 56\%$ ).

## 3.3.1.6. Postoperative oxygen parameters

3.3.1.6.1.  $PaO_2$ . The combined effect of 10 studies of a total 445 patients comparing the effect of high FiO<sub>2</sub> with low FiO<sub>2</sub> on PaO<sub>2</sub> demonstrated a lower postoperative PaO<sub>2</sub> with high FiO<sub>2</sub> (mean difference [MD] -5.03 mmHg, 95% CI, -7.90 to -2.16, P < 0.001)(Fig. 3Bf1). Heterogeneity between studies was low (I<sup>2</sup> = 44%). The Egger test for publication bias was non-significant (P = 0.595) and the funnel plot did not demonstrate asymmetry by visual inspection (supplementary Fig. S1B).

3.3.1.6.2. A-aDO<sub>2</sub>. Five studies of a total 211 patients reported on A-aDO<sub>2</sub>. The high FiO<sub>2</sub> group had larger A-aDO<sub>2</sub> than the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group (MD 3.75 mmHg, 95% CI 1.74–5.76, P < 0.001 (Fig. 3Bf2). Low heterogeneity was observed in the analysis ( $I^2 = 20\%$ ).

3.3.1.6.3. SpO<sub>2</sub>. Six studies of a total 588 patients reported on SpO<sub>2</sub>. There was no significant difference in SpO<sub>2</sub> between the groups (MD -0.20%, 95% CI -0.88–0.47, P = 0.560) (Fig. 3Bf3). A moderate level of heterogeneity was shown (I<sup>2</sup> = 72%).

3.3.1.7. Pulmonary function (FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC). Two studies of 90 patients reported on the FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC. There was no significant difference in FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC between the two groups (MD -0.28%, 95% CI -6.23-5.66, P = 0.930) (Fig. 3Bg). Low heterogeneity was observed (I<sup>2</sup> = 0%).

## 3.3.2. ICU admissions

Four studies of a total 2428 patients reported on ICU admissions with 63/1209 events in the high FiO<sub>2</sub> group and 63/1219 events in the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group. No significant difference was noted in ICU admissions between the groups (RR 0.94, 95% CI 0.55–1.60, P = 0.810) (Fig. 3C). A low heterogeneity was observed (I<sup>2</sup> = 27%).

## 3.3.3. Length of hospital stay

Ten studies of total 2863 patients reported on length of hospital stay. The pooled mean length of hospital stay was 9.4 days in the high FiO<sub>2</sub> and 9.3 days in the low FiO<sub>2</sub>, not significantly differing between the groups (MD 0.27 d, 95% CI -0.28-0.81, P = 0.340) (Fig. 3D). A low heterogeneity was observed ( $I^2 = 47\%$ ). The Egger test for publication bias was non-significant (P = 0.548) and the funnel plot did not demonstrate asymmetry by visual inspection (Supplementary Fig. S1A).

#### 3.4. Subgroup and sensitivity analyses

Two studies reported data on patients with high BMI (>30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>) [34,37]. Subgroup analysis did not show any significant differences in mortality, atelectasis, pneumonia, SpO<sub>2</sub>, FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC, or ICU admission compared with those examined in general population of patients. However, the length of hospital stay was shorter in the high FiO<sub>2</sub> group than in the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group (MD -2.30, 95% CI -4.36 to -0.24, P = 0.030) and postoperative PaO<sub>2</sub> was not different between the two groups in this population (Table 3).

A sensitivity analysis of five trials which did not describe carrier gas [37,47,49,53,58] did not show changes in effect direction or statistical significance. A sensitivity analysis by the time period of the intervention revealed that severity of atelectasis and A-aDO<sub>2</sub> were significantly different between the two groups only when intervention was performed

#### Table 2

Quality of the evidence (Summary of Findings table).\*

Outcomes	Illustrative	comparative risks* (95% CI)	Relative effect/Mean	No of Participants	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk	Difference (95% CI)	(studies)		
	Low O <sub>2</sub>	High O <sub>2</sub>				
Mortality	18 per 1000	17 per 1000 (8 to 36)	<b>RR 0.91</b> (0.42 to 1.97)	3860 (8 studies)	$\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus$ low	
Incidence of atelectasis (chest radiography)	99 per 1000	126 per 1000 (99 to 161)	<b>RR 1.27</b> (1 to 1.62)	1948 (7 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate	
Incidence of atelectasis (CT)	600 per 1000	810 per 1000 (618 to 1000)	<b>RR 1.35</b> (1.03 to 1.77)	76 (2 studies)	$\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus$ low	
Severity of atelectasis		The mean severity of atelectasis in the intervention groups was <b>2.04 higher</b> (0.14 to 3.94 higher)	<b>MD 2.04</b> (0.14 to 3.94)	109 (3 studies)	⊕⊝⊝⊝ very low	
Pneumonia	74 per 1000	88 per 1000 (55 to 142)	<b>RR 1.19</b> (0.74 to 1.92)	1797 (4 studies)	$\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus$ low	
Respiratory failure	38 per 1000	48 per 1000 (31 to 77)	<b>RR 1.29</b> (0.82 to 2.04)	1637 (2 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate	
Postoperative Pulmonary Complications (PPCs)	193 per 1000	<b>202 per 1000</b> (133 to 306)	<b>RR 1.05</b> (0.69 to 1.59)	1058 (3 studies)	$\oplus \oplus \ominus \Theta$ low	
PaO <sub>2</sub>		The mean $PaO_2$ in the intervention groups was <b>5.03 lower</b> (7.9 to 2.16 lower)	<b>MD -5.03</b> (-7.90 to -2.16)	445 (10 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate	
A-aDO <sub>2</sub>		The mean A-aDO <sub>2</sub> in the intervention groups was <b>3.75 higher</b> $(1.74 \text{ to } 5.76 \text{ higher})$	<b>MD 3.75</b> (1.74 to 5.76)	211 (5 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊝ moderate	
SpO <sub>2</sub>		The mean $SpO_2$ in the intervention groups was <b>0.20 lower</b> (0.86 lower to 0.46 higher)	<b>MD -0.20</b> (-0.86 to 0.46)	588 (6 studies)	$\oplus \ominus \ominus \ominus$ very low	
FEV <sub>1</sub> /FVC		The mean FEV <sub>1</sub> /FVC in the intervention groups was <b>0.28 lower</b> (6.23 lower to 5.66 higher)	<b>MD -0.28</b> (-6.23 to 5.66)	90 (2 studies)	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \Theta$ moderate	
ICU admission	52 per 1000	<b>49 per 1000</b> (28 to 83)	<b>RR 0.94</b> (0.55 to 1.6)	2428 (4 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate	
Length of hospital stay		The mean length of hospital stay in the intervention groups was <b>0.27 higher</b> (0.28 lower to 0.81 higher)	<b>MD 0.27</b> (-0.28 to 0.81)	2863 (10 studies)	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \Theta$ moderate	

A-aDO<sub>2</sub>: alveolar-arterial oxygen gradient; CI: confidence interval; CT: computed tomography; FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC: the ratio of forced expiratory volume in 1 s to forced vital capacity; ICU: intensive care unit; MD: mean difference; No: number of patients; PaO<sub>2</sub>: arterial partial oxygen pressure; **PPCs**: postoperative pulmonary complications; RR: risk ratio; SpO<sub>2</sub>: arterial oxygen saturation by pulse oximetry.

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence. **High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect. **Moderate quality:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate. **Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate. **Very low quality:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

<sup>\*</sup> The basis for the **assumed risk** (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The **corresponding risk** (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the **relative effect** of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

during emergence. In addition, sensitivity analysis excluding "high" risk of bias studies resulted in a reduced length of hospital stay in the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group (MD 0.42, 95% CI 0.07–0.76, P = 0.020).

#### 4. Discussion

A meta-analysis of 26 RCTs involving 4991 patients demonstrated that high and low  $FiO_2$  did not differentially affect the mortality in adult, non-thoracic surgical patients. Nor were differences noted in the incidence of pneumonia, respiratory failure, PPCs, and ICU admission, and length of hospital stay between the groups. The high  $FiO_2$  was, however, associated with a significantly higher incidence and severity of atelectasis.

Whether high perioperative vs. low FiO<sub>2</sub> is related to an increased risk of postoperative mortality has been controversial: favorable [25], harmful [12,61], or no effects [14,15,23,24]. In all eight studies reviewed in our meta-analysis, high FiO<sub>2</sub> was not associated with an increased risk of mortality [43,44,48,51,54,57–59]. These findings are consistent with those documented recently [14,23,24]. However, they had very wide CIs and inconsistent results, indicating that the ability to accurately determine the strength of the association between high FiO<sub>2</sub> and mortality may be limited. Reported risk ratios relating the mortality to high FiO<sub>2</sub> ranged from a RR of 0.17 (95% CI, 0.02–1.37) [51] to one with very wide Cl (RR, 1.57; 95% CI, 0.52–4.75) [58] and pooled RR 0.91 (95% CI 0.42–1.97).

Interestingly, two [54,58] of eight studies showed relatively greater RR (1.54 and 1.57) for the mortality than in other six studies (0.17 to 0.35), suggesting an association between high FiO<sub>2</sub> and increased risk of death. In one study with high RR [54], the long-term mortality among patients receiving high FiO<sub>2</sub> was pronounced especially in those who had cancer surgery [61]. It was postulated that high FiO<sub>2</sub> might have a negative impact on mortality possibly through neovascularization [62], growth factor stimulation, formation of reactive oxygen species [63], and immunosuppression [64] in cancer patients. In the other study showing great RR (1.57), most (~85%) of the patients had oncological surgery [58]. In contrast, Podolyak et al. [65] reported that supplemental perioperative oxygen did not augment postoperative mortality, either in overall or in patients with cancer. Further RCTs are needed to determine whether the high perioperative FiO<sub>2</sub> is associated with an increased risk of mortality, especially in patients with cancer surgery.

Despite the increased incidence and severity of atelectasis in the high  $FiO_2$  group, the incidence of postoperative pneumonia, respiratory failure or PPCs did not differ between the two groups in our metaanalysis. These results are in line with previous ones demonstrating that postoperative pneumonia is not associated with an absorption atelectasis occurred during anesthesia [66,67]. An animal study demonstrated that reduction of atelectasis with exogenous surfactants or open lung ventilation attenuated bacterial growth and translocation and reduced the risk of pneumonia [10]. However, Group B streptococci intentionally injected into the trachea to induce bacterial pneumonia in

50

'n 50 100

100

High Flo2         Low Flo2         Float Ratio         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio         Implified         Low Flo2         Low Flo3         Low Flo3 <th>Cl IV, Randon, 95% Cl     V, Randon, 95</th>	Cl IV, Randon, 95% Cl     V, Randon, 95
Ba         High Flo2         Low Flo2         Risk Ratio           Study or Subgroup         243         5.41         7.33         0.30         7.42         8.16         7.4         1.4         8.2%         -4.00[+12.3,4           Bend 2005         0         1.48         5.35         2.68.         1.57[0.5,2,7]         4.00[+12.3,4         Bend 2002         7.57         9.8         10         9.66         1.1         4.24         1.92.         4.00[+12.3,4         Bend 2002         7.57         9.8         10         9.66         1.01         10         7.5%         -4.00[+12.3,4         Bend 2002         1.52         A.40[+37,1]         Upper 1.02.         1.11         2.21         1.14         0.22.8         -4.00[+12.3,4         Bend 2002         1.28         1.08.%         -5.00[+50,1]         Upper 1.02.01         1.01         1.01         1.01         Upper 1.01         1.01         Upper 1.02.01         1.01         1.01         1.00         1.01	321 321 323 329 429 429 429 429 429 429 429 4
hene 2013       0       30       0       30       0       30       0       30       0       7527       98       10       9568       10.16       10       7,5%       -20.41 (23.19,-11         terrando 2020       8       362       5       355       256.8%       1.57 (1952, 4.79]	63] 77] 449] 49] 49] 49] 49] 49] 49] 4
arrando 2020       8       822       5       355       28.8 %       1.57 (0.52, 4.79)         refr 2000       1       250       6       250       117 (0.24, 1.72)         variable 2010       1       250       6       250       117 (0.24, 1.72)         variable 2010       0       128       0       1250       6       286       1.57 (0.52, 4.79)         variable 2010       0       128       0       1250       6       286       7.7       7.1 (8.8)       7.7       7.1 (8.8)       7.7       7.1 (8.8)       5.00 (8.5), (1.50) (2.5) (2.5) (1.50) (2.5) (2.5) (1.50) (2.5) (2.5) (1.50) (2.5) (2.5) (1.50) (2.5) (	77]
er zuou 1 zou 6 200 11.0% 0.17.0% 2.1002,137] 2020 0 126 0 125 Notestimable synor 2009 30 685 20 701 45.6% 1.54 (9.8.8, 2.69) 406 asser 2014 62 6 26 67 7 27 18.9% 5.00 (3.51,	39] 49] 49] 49] 49] 40] 40] 40] 40] 40] 40] 40] 40
Star         Bigh Flo2         Low Flo2         Risk Ratio           Star         High Flo3         High Flo3         Low Flo2           Star         High Flo3         High Flo3         Not Starting           High Flo3         High Flo3         High Flo3         High Flo3           Stard or start andiography         High Flo3         High Flo3         High Flo3           High Flo3         High Flo3         High Flo3         High Flo3           Stard or start and start and start         High Flo3         High Flo3         High Flo3           Stard or start and start an	499 +
whord 2009       30       685       20       701       14       688       21.008       1.4       1.088       2.6       1.008       7.4       1.28       20       1.108       -7.00       7.10       7.8       1.28       20       1.008       7.4       1.28       20       1.108       -7.00       7.10       7.8       7.8       1.28       20       1.108       -7.00       7.10       7.8	
0.2021       0       49       1       51       5.4%       0.35 [0.01, 8.31]         (95% C)       1       1935       1925       100.01       0.31 [0.42, 1.97]         events       39       35       35       36       2.38       8.38       2.09       2.01 [0.01, 1.01]         greents       33       32       65       7       22       10.01       1.01       10         or overall effect Z = 0.24 (P = 0.81)       0.01       0.1       1       10       10       Favours [ligh FIO.2]       Favours [ligh FIO.2]       223       222       100.01       5.03 [7.90, -2.         High FIO2       Low FIO2       Risk Ratio       Risk Ratio       233       9.20 [0.00]       5.03 [7.90, -2.         Vor Subgroup       Events       Total       Weight       M.4, Random, 95% CI       M.4, Random, 95% CI       M.4, Random, 95% CI         (1cbest radiography       1139       7       16       5       14       7.3%       1.23 [0.50, 3.00]       40.01 (7.2, 8.4]         1199       7       16       5       14       7.3%       1.23 [0.50, 3.00]       40.01 (7.2, 8.4]       40.01 (7.6, 8.6, 8.6]         1199       7       16       14       7.3%       1.23 [	161 -50 -50 -50 -50 -50 -50 -50 -50
(g5% Cl)         1935         1925         100.0%         0.91 [0.42, 1.97]           events         39         35         35         35         35         36         31         32         95         7         32         18.2%         -4.00 [-10.58, 1           proverall effect Z = 0.24 (P = 0.81)         0.01         0.1         1	58) 69 -50 25 5 Favours (how FIO2) -50 25 10 -50 25 5 -50 25
Wrents         39         35           generalit, Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.26; Ch <sup>2</sup> = 7.14; df = 5 (P = 0.21); P = 30%         0.01         0.1         10	68) + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
Biggenetity Tail*= 0.28; ChiP = 7.14, die 5 (P = 0.21); P = 30%,       0.01       0.1       1       10 <th10< th="">       10       10</th10<>	16]
High FIO2         Low FIO2         Risk Ratio         Favours (jow FIO2)         High FIO2         Favours (jow FIO2)         High FIO2         East cold = 1 (1 + 2 + 9 - 0.00); P = 0.00); P = 0.00); P = 0.000;	-50 -25 0 25 5 Favours (low FIO2) Favours (high FIO2)
High FO2         Low FO2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio           y or Subgroup         Exerts         Total         Weight         M.H. Random, 95% CI         Bf2           1099         7         16         5         14         7.3%         1.23 (0.50, 3.00)	-50 -25 Ó 25 · Favours (Iow FIO2) Favours (high FIO2)
High FiO2         Low FiO2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio           dy or Subgroup         Events         Total         Weight         M.H. Random, 95% C1         Bf2           1 1993         7         16         5         14         7.3%         1.23 (0.50, 3.00)           ant/2119         14         30         10         10.14 (Keg) 14         20.3         8         16         29         13         14         6.0%         1.00 [F68, 8.8	Favours (low FIO2) Favours (high FIO2)
ia         High FIO2         Low FIO2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio         Bf2           undy or Subgroup         Events         Total         Weight         M-H, Random, 95% C1         M-H, Random, 95% C1         Bf2           1.1 chestradiography         xa 1999         7         16         5         14         7.3%         1.23 (0.50, 3.00)	
Bf2         Bf2           usy or Subgroup Events Total Weight M-H, Random, 95% CI         M-H, Random, 95% CI         M-H           start statiography         16 bit 14 7.3% 1.23 (0.50, 3.00]         M-H           and/2019 14 30 10 30 14.6% 1.40 (0.74, 2.64)         Mean 201 for the station of the st	
Statistradiography         High/H02         Low/H02         Mean Uttratements           16199         7         16         5         14         7/3%         1.23 (0.50, 3.00)         Study or Study	
ra 1999 7 16 5 14 7.3% 1.23 (0.50, 3.00)	Mean Difference
kandr 2019 14 30 10 30 14.6% 1.40 (0.74, 2.64) - Akca 1999 30 8 16 29 13 14 6.0% 1.00 (6.86, 8.8	I IV, Random, 95% CI
.2020 3 46 4 44 2.25% U.72[017,302]	
20 30 126 17 125 200 1.75 10.02 3.01	
hoff2009 54 685 50 701 42.8% 1.11(10.75,1.60)	á —
2020 12 48 5 23 7.0% 1.15[0.46,2.88]	
otar(195% CI) 981 967 100.0% 1.27 [1.00, 1.62] Total (95% CI) 106 105 100.0% 3.75 [1.74, 5.74	1
18/PMBS 12/ 95 Heterogenetity: Taul = 0, 00 - Chile 2 = 26 - 46 - 0.951: P = 20% Heterogenetity: Taul = 0, 00 - Chile 2 = 26 - 46 - 0.951: P = 20%	
ngeneranj, na – cono, na – cono, na – cono, na – cono de la cono d	-10 -5 U 5 10 Favours (hinh FiO2) Favours flow FiO2)
	raiouis (ingirrio2) - raiouis (iow PIO2)
cr	
1999 15 16 9 14 425% 1.46[0.97,2.20] Bf3	
17 2019 23 30 18 30 57.5% 17.28 (U.9.U. 18.2) Thigh FiO2 Low FiO2 Mean Difference all 95% (C) 46 44 100.0% 1351 (10.31.177)	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Meight IV, Random, 95%	.1 IV, Random, 95% CI
rogeneity, Tau" = 0.00, Chi" = 0.23, dr = 1 (P = 0.63); P = 0%	s)
for overall effect Z = 2.21 (P = 0.03) Eskandr 2019 95.2 1.27 30 95.73 1.41 30 21.8% -0.53 [-1.27, 0.1	a) 🔸
Grei/1999 94 3 112 94 3 119 20.4% 0.00 [0.77, 0.7	1 +
0.05 0.2 1 5 20 Mackintosh 2012 94.7 2.36 25 95.3 3.14 25 11.1% -0.60 (-2.14, 0.9	1 +
for subarous differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.12. df = 1 (P = 0.73), P= 0% Favours [high FIO2] Favours [low FIO2] Park 2020 98.48 1.8 23 97.48 2.71 23 13.1% 1.00 [-0.33, 2.3	-
Zorembra 2010 95.7 2.1 71 96.9 22 71 21.4% -1.20 [-1.91,-0.4	1 •
Ь Тата 105К сп. 201 207 400.01. о 201 207 400.01. о 201 207 400.01.	1
High FiO2 Low FiO2 Mean Difference Mean Difference Human	·
dy or Stubgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI IV, Random, 95% CI Testform consultation + 7 - 160 (20 - 65.)	-10 -5 0 5 10
1999 3 1.8 16 25 3.2 14 33.0% 0.50 [+1.39, 2.39]	Favours (low FiO2) Favours (high FiO2)
#2002 6.8 3.4 10 2.6 1.1 10 29.4% 4.20[19.9,6.41]	
#k2014 5.5 3.4 30 3.8 2.4 29 37.6% 1.70 (0.20, 3.20)	
esis ch 56 53 100.0% 20.110.14.3.9.4.1	Mean Difference
Study or Subtratin Maan SD Tatal Maan SD Tatal Weidth W Random 05%	I IV. Random, 95% CI
20 (0 (0 20) - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 -	
Favours (jingh Fluz) Favours (jiow Fluz) AKCA 1999 80 6 10 80 12 14 04.35 UUU (-4.1,4	J <u>T</u>
Estamor/2019 84.7 21.7 30 85.5 17.5 30 35.5% -0.80[-10.78,9.1	4
High FiO2 Low FiO2 Risk Ratio Risk Ratio Risk Ratio Total (95% CI) 46 44 100.0% -0.28 [-6.23, 5.6	1 T
ułty or Studgroup Events Total Weight M.H. Random, 95% Cl M.H. Random, 95% Cl Heterogeneity, Tay <sup>2</sup> = 0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.02; df = 1 (P = 0.90); P = 0%	100 -50 0 50
en 2013 1 30 4 4% 0.33 (0.04,3.03)	Favours flow FiO2L Favours (high FiO2)
(20 3) 1 20 13 123 13 123 137 102 [037].2.1]	r aroars pon riozji i aroars (ngli riozj
	Diel: Deti-
5% CI) 890 907 100.0% 1.19 [0.74, 1.92]	KISK Källö M H Pandom 05% Cl
events 76 67 Support Events Total Weight MH, Kahloon, 95% U	M-H, Kall00M, 95% CI
Togenerii, tau = μμγ, μm = 4,4, μm = 3(P = 0,21); P = 33% 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Countrol Methyle 2, 200 4 148 5 143 14.1% 0.7/ [0,2,12]	
A unservencesc 2 = 0.15 ( = 0.47) Favours [high FiO2] Favours [high FiO2] Favours [high FiO2] Fill 200 ( 0.47) [high FiO2] Favours [high FiO2] Fav	
in coreco + 1 cor 2 cor 30.09 i.39 (00.07,10.04) Markentar 2009, 50, 685, 44, 701, 56, 684, 41, 16, 10, 70, 173	+
megnon 2003 50 003 44 701 30.070 1.10 [0.73, 1.72]	
d	•
1 High FlO2 Low FlO2 Risk Ratio Risk Ratio Total (95% Cl) 1209 1219 100.0% 0.94 (0.55, 1.60)	1
d         High FO2         Low FIO2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio         Total (95% CI)         1209         1219         100.0%         0.94 (0.55, 1.60)           dy or Subgroup         Events         Total         Vents         Total events         63         63	
High FlO2         Low FlO2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio         Total (95% CI)         1209         1219         100.0%         0.94 [0.55, 1.60]           y or Subgroup         Events         Total         Veight         M-H, Random, 95% CI         Total events         6.3         6.3           20         2         126         0         125         2.3%         4.36 (0.24, 102.30)         Heterogeneby: Tau"= 0.08; Ch"= 4.13, df= 3 (P= 0.25); P= 27%	101 01 1 10
High Fi02         Low Fi02         Risk Ratio         Total (95% CI)         1209         1219         100.0%         0.94 [0.55, 1.60]           ror Stubgroup         Events         Total         Events         Total         Events         63         63           10         2         126         0         125         2.3%         4.96 [0.24, 102.30]         Heterogeneity; Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.05; Ch <sup>2</sup> = 4.13; df = 2.05; L <sup>2</sup> = 2.7%           17/2009         38         685         31         701         97.7%         1.25 [0.79, 1.99]         Total events         Testfor overall effect Z = 0.24 (P = 0.81)	3.01 0.1 1 10 Favours (high FiO2) Favours (high FiO2)
High FIO2         Low FIO2         Risk Ratio         Total (95% CI)         1209         1219         100.0%         0.94 (0.55, 1.60)           or Subgroup         Events         Total         Events         Total         Events         Total         63         63         63         63         63         63         63         63         63         63         7.5%         7.7%         1.25 (0.78, 1.99)         Total events         Total events         53         63         63         7.5%         7.7%         1.25 (0.78, 1.99)         Total events         Total events         63         63         7.5% </td <td>1.01 0.1 1 10 Favours (high FiO2) Favours (low FiO2)</td>	1.01 0.1 1 10 Favours (high FiO2) Favours (low FiO2)
High FiO2         Low FiO2         Risk Ratio         Total (95% CI)         1209         1219         100.0%         0.94 (0.55, 1.60)           ror Stabgroup         Events         Total         Events         Total         63         63           20         2         126         0         125         23%         4.98 (0.24, 102.30)         Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.08; Chi* = 4.13; df = 3 (P = 0.25); P = 27%;           xf 2009         38         685         31         701         97.7%         1.25 (0.79, 1.99)         Total events         Fest for overall effect Z = 0.24 (P = 0.81)           195% CI         811         826         100.0%         1.29 (0.82, 2.04]         Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.024 (P = 0.81)	0.01 1 10 Favours (high FiO2) Favours (low FiO2)
High Flo2         Low Flo2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio           or Subgroup         Events         Total (95% CI)         1209         1219         100.0%         0.94 (0.55, 1.60)           0         2         126         0         125         2.3%         4.96 (0.24, 102.30)           10         38         685         31         701         97.7%         1.25 (0.79, 1.99)           95% CI)         811         826         100.0%         1.29 (0.82, 2.04)         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)           995% CI)         811         826         100.0%         1.29 (0.82, 2.04)         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         1.29 (0.25); F = 27%         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         1.29 (0.25); F = 27%         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         1.29 (0.25); F = 27%         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         1.29 (0.25); F = 27%         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         1.29 (0.25); F = 27%         Total (95% CI)         Total	2.01 0.1 1 10 Favours (high FIO2) Favours (low FIO2)
High FiO2         Low FiO2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio         Total (95% CI)         1289         1219         100.0%         0.94 (0.55, 1.60)           vor Subgroup         Events         Total         Events         Total         Events         Sol         63	2.01 0.1 1 10 Favours (high FiO2) Favours (low FiO2) Mean Difference
High FR02         Low FR02         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio         Total (95% CI)         1209         1219         100.0%         0.94 (0.55, 1.60)           10         2         126         0         125         2.3%         4.96 (0.24, 102.30)         Total events         63         63           17.009         38         685         31         701         97.7%         1.25 (0.79, 1.99)         Total events         63         63           19.000         811         826         100.0%         1.29 (0.82, 2.04)         Total events         63         63           19.000         811         826         100.0%         1.29 (0.82, 2.04)         Total events         63         63           19.000         10         0.1         10         10         10         10           10.01         0.1         10         10         10         10         10           10.01         0.01         0.1         10         10         10         10           17.02         97.2%         Favours [high FiO2]         Favours [high FiO2]         Low FiO2         Mean Difference           17.01         0.01         0.01         10         10         10         10	0.01 0.1 10 Favours (high FIO2) Favours (hiw FIO2) Mean Difference Cl N, Random, 59% Cl
High Fi02         Low Fi02         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio         Total (95% CI)         1209         1219         100.0%         0.94 (0.55, 1.60)           20         2         126         0         125         23%         4.96 (0.24, 102.30)         Total events         63         63           70 2009         38         685         31         701         97.7%         1.25 (0.79, 1.99)         Total events         Festors events         63         63           (95% CI)         811         826         100.0%         1.29 (0.82, 2.04)         Total events         63         63           or overall effect Z = 1.11 (P = 0.38); P = 0%         0.01         0.1         1         10         100           Favours (how FIO2)         Favours (how FIO2)         Favours (how FIO2)         Study or Studgroup         Mean Difference, 196           6e/a 205         11.7         85.2         148         0.05         10.7         82.1         148         10.5         52.8         143         10.1         10.1         10.1         10.1         10.0         11.7         85.2         148         10.5         12.9         148         10.5         52.8         143         11.7         85.2         148         10.1	0.01 0.1 10 Favours (high FIO2) Favours (high FIO2) Mean Difference CI M, Random, 95% CI
Image: Definition of the sector of	0.01         1         10           Favours [high Fl02]         Favours [low Fl02]           Mean Difference         M. Random, 95% CI           11
d         High FlO2         Low FlO2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio           dy or Subgroup         Events         Total         Verints         Total         Verints         0.3         0.3         0.3         0.125         2.3%         4.36         0.21, 102.201         Total         Verints         0.3	0.01 0.1 10 Favours [high FIO2] Favours [low FIO2] Mean Difference CI M, Randem, 95% CI 1]
d         High FlO2         Low FlO2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio           hy or Subgroup         Events         Total         129         1219         100.0%         0.94 (0.55, 1.60)           200         2         126         0         125         2.3%         4.56 (0.2.3)         M-44, Random, 95% C1           hof 2009         38         685         31         701         97.7%         1.25 (0.79, 1.99)         1.25 (0.79, 1.99)         1.26 (0.79, 1.99)         1.26 (0.79, 1.99)         1.27 (0.0, 0)         0.01         0.1         1.0         100         100         100         100         1.001         0.01         1.0         100 </td <td>0.01 0.1 1 0 Favours (high FIO2) Favours (low FIO2) Mean Difference CI N, Random, 95% CI 11</td>	0.01 0.1 1 0 Favours (high FIO2) Favours (low FIO2) Mean Difference CI N, Random, 95% CI 11
Image: Non-State Control         Image: Non-State Control         Resk Ratio         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio         Image: Non-State Control         Image: Non-State Cont	0.01         0.1         10           Favours [high Fl02]         Favours [low Fl02]           Mean Difference         M. Random, 95% Cl           (1)
Imple Flo2         Low Flo2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio           yor Subgroup         Events         Total         Events         Total         Events         Total         Events         63         63           100         38         665         31         701         97.7%         1.25         [0.79, 1.99]         1.29         [0.82, 2.04]         1.05         1.20         1.20         [0.79, 1.49]         1.20         1.20         1.20         1.20         1.20         1.20         1.20         1.20         1.20         1.20         1.20         1.20         1.20	D01 0.1 10 Favours [high Fl02] Favours [low Fl02] CI Mean Difference CI M, Random, 95% CI 10
Id       High FlO2       Low FlO2       Risk Ratio       Risk Ratio         uby or Subgroup       2 tors       0       125       2.3%       4.36 (0.2.3, 10.2.3)       1.1         2020       2       126       0       1.25       2.3%       4.36 (0.2.3, 10.2.3)       1.1       1.1       1.0 <td>0.01 0.1 10 Favours (high FIO2) Favours (low FIO2) Mean Ofference CI M, Random, 95% CI 11 12 14 14 12 13 14 15 16 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17</td>	0.01 0.1 10 Favours (high FIO2) Favours (low FIO2) Mean Ofference CI M, Random, 95% CI 11 12 14 14 12 13 14 15 16 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17
d       High FlO2       Low FlO2       Risk Ratio       Risk Ratio         dy or Subgroup       2 total       0       120       0       120       0.0.0%       0.94 (0.55, 1.60)         020       2       128       0       125       2.3%       4.56 (0.2.0%)       M.44, Random, 95% C1         0407 2009       38       685       31       7.01       9.7.%       1.25 (0.79, 1.98)       1.25 (0.79, 1.98)         1 events       4.01       8.26       10.0.%       1.29 (0.82, 2.04)       1.15 (0.0.1 0.0)       1.01       1.01         1 events       3.1       0.01       0.1       0.1       0.1       1.01       1.00         For overall effect Z = 1.11 (P = 0.38), P = 0.%       0.01       0.1       0.1       1.01       1.00         For overall effect Z = 1.11 (P = 0.23), P = 0.%       0.01       0.1       0.1       1.01       1.00         For overall effect Z = 1.11 (P = 0.38), P = 0.%       0.01       0.1       0.1       1.01       1.00         For overall effect Z = 1.11 (P = 0.38), P = 0.%       0.01       0.1       Risk Ratio       Not overall effect Z = 0.2 (P = 0.81)       Nean Difference         tor overall effect Z = 1.11 (P = 0.23), P = 0.23), P = 0.26), P	0.01         0.1         10           Favours [high Fl02]         Favours [low Fl02]           Mean Difference         M. Random, 95% Cl           (1)
High Flo2         Low Flo2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio           20         2         126         0         125         23%         498 [024, 102.30]           20         2         126         0         125         23%         498 [024, 102.30]           20         2         126         0         125         23%         498 [024, 102.30]           20         38         685         31         701         97.7%         1.25 [0.79, 1.99]           geneths         40         31         826         100.0%         1.29 [0.82, 2.04]         4.00           perints         500         Chir = 0.78, of = 1 (P = 0.38), P = 0%         0.01         0.1         1         10           0 or verail effect Z = 1.11 (P = 0.27)         Favours [high FIO2]         Favours [high FIO2]         Favours [high FIO2]         Favours [high FIO2]         Low FIO2         Mean Difference           yor Subgroup         Events         Total         Stady or Subgroup         Mean SD         Total         Weight         Mandom, 95% CI           word Subgroup         Events         Total         Stady or Subgroup         Mean SD         Total         Weight M.R.Random, 95% CI           word Subgroup         Events         Total </td <td>0.01         0.1         10           Favours [high Flo2]         Favours [liw Flo2]           Mean Difference         M. Random, 95% Cl           (1)        </td>	0.01         0.1         10           Favours [high Flo2]         Favours [liw Flo2]           Mean Difference         M. Random, 95% Cl           (1)
Imple Flo2         Low Flo2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio           yor Subgroup         Events         Total         Vering Structure         M-H, Random, 95% CI           200         2         126         0         125         2.3%         4.36 (0.2.4)         0.23 (0.2.4)           200         3         665         3         1701         97.7%         1.25 (0.7) (0.7) (0.9)         9         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.2.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.2.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.5), 1.20 (0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)         1.29 (0.0.7) (0.9)	D.01 0.1 10 Favours [high FIO2] Favours [low FIO2] Mean Difference CI N, Random, 95% CI 1] 7 4]
d         High FlO2         Low FlO2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio           hy or Subgroup         2 total         0         125         2.3%         4.86 (0.24, 102.30)         Total (95% CI)         1209         12.9         0.0.0%         0.94 (0.55, 1.60)           hof 2009         38         685         31         701         97.7%         1.25 (0.79, 1.99)         1.25 (0.79, 1.99)         Total (95% CI)         1.36 (0.0.0%         2.01 (0.1 (0.1 (0.1 (0.1 (0.1 (0.1 (0.1 (	0.01         0.1         10           Favours [high FIO2]         Favours [low FIO2]           C1         Mean Difference           MR. Random, 95% C1         11           71
d         High FlO2         Low FlO2         Risk Ratio         Risk Ratio           dy or Subgroup         Events         Total Verifix         MH, Random, 95% CI         MH, Random, 95% CI         MH, Random, 95% CI         MH, Random, 95% CI         Total events         63         63         63           0200         2         126         0         125         2.3%         4.36 (D.2.1) (0.2.0)         MH, Random, 95% CI         MH, Random, 95% CI         Helerogenety, Tau" = 0.09; Ch <sup>2</sup> = 4.13, df = 3, 0° = 0.25); F = 27%         Total events         63         63         63           al (95% CI)         38         685         31         701         97.7%         1.25 (D.79, 1.99)         Interview         Favorus [high FIO2]         Favorus [high FIO2] <td>0.01         0.1         10           Favours [high FlO2]         Favours [low FlO2]           CI         Mean Difference           (1)        </td>	0.01         0.1         10           Favours [high FlO2]         Favours [low FlO2]           CI         Mean Difference           (1)

Fig. 3. Forest plot comparing the effect of high and low inspired oxygen fraction (FiO<sub>2</sub>) on mortality (A), pulmonary outcomes {B; incidence (Ba) and severity (Bb) of atelectasis, pneumonia (Bc), respiratory failure (Bd), postoperative pulmonary complications (PPCs, Be), postoperative oxygen parameters [arterial partial oxygen pressure (PaO<sub>2</sub>, Bf1), alveolar-arterial oxygen gradient (A-aDO<sub>2</sub>, Bf2), and arterial oxygen saturation by pulse oximetry (SpO<sub>2</sub>, Bf3)], and the ratio of forced expiratory volume in 1 s to forced vital capacity (FEV1/FVC, Bg)}, intensive care unit (ICU) admission (C) and length of hospital stay (D). CI: confidence interval; M-H: Mantel-Haenszel; IV: inverse variance.

#### Table 3

Subgroup analysis for patients with BMI  $>30 \text{ kg/m}^2$ .

Outcomes	Studies	Ν	Events, High FiO <sub>2</sub> , n/N	Events, Low FiO <sub>2</sub> , n/N	Risk ratio (95% CI)	$I^2$	P value
Mortality	All	8	39/1935	35/1925	0.91 [0.42, 1.97]	30	0.810
	BMI > 30	1	1/102	3/111	0.36 [0.04, 3.43]		0.380
Atelectasis	All	7	127/981	96/967	1.27 [1.00, 1.62]	0	0.050
	BMI > 30	2	23/132	17/141	1.40 [0.83, 2.37]	0	0.210
Pneumonia	All	4	76/890	67/907	1.19 [0.74, 1.92]	33	0.470
	BMI > 30	1	6/102	5/111	1.31 [0.41, 4.15]		0.650
ICU admission	All	4	63/1209	63/1219	0.94 [0.55, 1.60]	27	0.810
	BMI > 30	1	11/102	9/111	1.33 [0.57, 3.08]		0.510
Outcomes	Studies	Studies (N	N) High FiO <sub>2</sub> , N	Low FiO <sub>2</sub> , N	Mean difference (95% CI)	$I^2$	P value
PaO <sub>2</sub>	All	10	223	222	-5.03 [-7.90, -2.16]	44	< 0.001
	BMI > 30	1	30	30	-4.00 [-9.77, 1.77]		0.170
SpO <sub>2</sub>	All	6	291	297	-0.20 [-0.86, 0.46]	63	0.550
	BMI > 30	1	30	30	-0.53 [ $-1.21$ , 0.15]		0.130
FEV <sub>1</sub> /FVC	All	2	46	44	-0.28 [-6.23, 5.66]	0	0.930
	BMI > 30	1	30	30	-0.80 [-10.78, 9.18]		0.880
Hospital stay	All	10	1447	1416	0.27 [-0.28, 0.81]	47	0.340
	BMI > 30	1	102	111	-2.30 [-4.36, -0.24]		0.030

BMI: body mass index; CI: confidence interval; FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC: the ratio of the forced expiratory volume in one second to forced vital capacity; ICU: intensive care unit; N: number of studies or patients; n: number of events; PaO<sub>2</sub>: arterial partial oxygen pressure; SpO<sub>2</sub>: arterial oxygen saturation by pulse oximetry.

the collapsed lung region in this study. It is likely that, although atelectasis itself does not complicate pneumonia, it may contribute to the development of PPCs in the presence of various pre-existing factors, e.g., chronic bronchitis, smoking history, dehydration, malnutrition, placement of a nasogastric tube, or poor oral hygiene [6,68,69].

On the contrary, several previous meta-analyses reported no differences in the incidence of atelectasis between the high and low FiO<sub>2</sub> groups [14,17]. Discrepancy among the studies could be, at least in part, explained by type of inspired gas mixture. N<sub>2</sub>O promotes absorption atelectasis in the lung as effectively as breathing 100% oxygen [26] and thus its presence in the inhaled gas mixture might have increased the incidence of atelectasis in the low FiO<sub>2</sub> group, resulting in a comparable incidence of atelectasis between the groups. In fact, in the preliminary sensitivity analysis, we did not find a significant difference in the incidence of atelectasis between the high and low FiO<sub>2</sub> groups when the studies using N<sub>2</sub>O in the inhaled gas mixture were included (RR, 0.09; 95% CI, 0.76–1.56, P = 0.630).

Atelectasis has been reported to increase along with BMI during general anesthesia in normal and overweight patients in forms of compression as well as absorption atelectasis [28,29]. However, our subgroup analysis on patients with BMI >30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> did not show any significant differences of clinical outcomes, including mortality, atelectasis, pneumonia, and ICU admission compared with the general population. This finding is in line with that of Hedenstierna et al. [70], in which atelectasis was not further increased in the obese with BMI  $\geq$ 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> undergoing general anesthesia.

Postoperative  $PaO_2$  was decreased and thus A-aDO<sub>2</sub> was increased in patients given high  $FiO_2$  while  $SpO_2$  was comparable between the groups, being consistent with a previous meta-analysis [8]. The discrepancy between  $PaO_2$  and  $SpO_2$  may be explained by the oxyhemoglobin saturation curve, showing a plateau at high  $PaO_2$ . The postoperative oxygen saturation does not appear to be a surrogate marker of clinical outcomes in this circumstance in healthy patients.

#### 4.1. Strengths and limitations

Our meta-analysis is the comprehensive and most up-to-date search of the worldwide literature without restriction to English-written articles only. It also comprises a large number of RCTs (n = 26) and clinically-important clinical outcomes (e.g., mortality, pneumonia, respiratory failure, PPCs, ICU admissions, and the length of hospital stay), excluding the studies that used N<sub>2</sub>O as a carrier gas to rule out its possible effect on atelectasis or pneumonia.

There are several limitations in our meta-analysis. First, the study conditions and the time period of intervention were not identical. We divided the patients into high  $FiO_2$  and low  $FiO_2$  groups according to the dosage of inspired oxygen during the intervention period, as did most of the previous studies. However, a high concentration of oxygen is generally used in a similar manner at induction of anesthesia or at emergence from anesthesia in the both groups. The influence of high oxygen concentration also in the low  $FiO_2$  group may not be completely ruled out. Ideally, the high  $FiO_2$  group should include any patients who were exposed to high oxygen concentration for even a short period of time during surgery, and patients of low  $FiO_2$  group should not be exposed to high inspired oxygen concentration at any time during the anesthesia.

Second, the duration and time period of intervention exposed to high or low FiO<sub>2</sub> differed markedly among the studies from only at emergence of general anesthesia to during (i.e., maintenance period) and for 2-to-24 postoperative hrs. Different duration and time period of designated FiO<sub>2</sub> may differentially affect clinical outcomes. Indeed, sensitivity analysis by the time period of intervention (maintenance vs. emergence) revealed that all outcomes except PaO<sub>2</sub> were comparable between high and low FiO<sub>2</sub> groups when intervention was attempted during the maintenance period, whereas atelectasis was more severe and A-aDO<sub>2</sub> larger at high FiO<sub>2</sub> when intervention was attempted during the emergence period. Third, the results of mortality (i.e., low-quality evidence) due to low incidence and limited number of studies should be interpreted carefully. Given the low incidence, the size of required information to demonstrate a relative risk reduction at an estimate with a type I error of 5% and a type II error of 20% is 5262 patients, which is approximately 1400 larger than the current sample size. Nevertheless, mathematical predictions do not appear to change the results with additional data (data not shown). Lastly, outcome measures such as pneumonia or PPCs were defined differently and their follow-up periods varied among the pooled trials, and the criteria for ICU admission or hospital discharge were diverse and not well described. Future RCTs or meta-analyses may require consensus definitions for standardized endpoints, as suggested by Abbott et al. [71].

## 5. Conclusions

There is a lack of evidence that the high  $FiO_2$  compared to low  $FiO_2$  has a deleterious impact on the mortality in adult patients undergoing non-thoracic surgery under general anesthesia. The incidence of pneumonia, respiratory failure, PPCs, ICU admissions, and length of hospital

stay were comparable between the groups; while the incidence and the severity of atelectasis were increased and postoperative  $PaO_2$  was lowered by high FiO<sub>2</sub>. It is suggested that clinicians should not be reluctant to administer a high FiO<sub>2</sub> in an effort to reduce adverse events during general anesthesia.

## Authors' contributions

Planning the study design and methodology: CHL, HJK. Devising search strategies: CHL, HJK. Conducting searches: JH, SC, YHK. Determining eligibility of search results: JH, SC, YHK, CHL. Extracting and assessing data validity: JH, SC, YHK, CHL. Data analyses: CHL, YHK, Data interpretation: CHL, YHK, KYY, Statistical analysis: CHL, HJK. Writing manuscript: CHL, HJK, KYY. Reviewing of final version: all authors.

### **Declarations of interests**

All authors report no conflict of interests.

## Funding

This study was supported by Korea University grants.

## Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinane.2021.110461.

#### References

- [1] World Health Organization. Global guidelines for the prevention of surgical site infection. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2016.
- [2] Berríos-Torres SI, Umscheid CA, Bratzler DW, Leas B, Stone EC, Kelz RR, et al. Centers for disease control and prevention guideline for the prevention of surgical site infection, 2017. JAMA Surg 2017;152:784–91. https://doi.org/10.1001/ jamasurg.2017.0904.
- [3] Frerk C, Mitchell VS, McNarry AF, Mendonca C, Bhagrath R, Patel A, et al. Difficult airway society 2015 guidelines for management of unanticipated difficult intubation in adults. Br J Anaesth 2015;115:827–48. https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/ aev371.
- [4] Higgs A, McGrath BA, Goddard C, Rangasami J, Suntharalingam G, Gale R, et al. Guidelines for the management of tracheal intubation in critically ill adults. Br J Anaesth 2018;120:323–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2017.10.021.
- [5] Lundquist H, Hedenstierna G, Strandberg A, Tokics L, Brismar B. CT-assessment of dependent lung densities in man during general anaesthesia. Acta Radiol 1995;36: 626–32.
- [6] Rothen HU, Sporre B, Engberg G, Wegenius G, Reber A, Hedenstierna G. Prevention of atelectasis during general anaesthesia. Lancet 1995;345:1387–91. https://doi. org/10.1016/s0140-6736(95)92595-3.
- [7] Loeckinger A, Kleinsasser A, Keller C, Schaefer A, Kolbitsch C, Lindner KH, et al. Administration of oxygen before tracheal extubation worsens gas exchange after general anesthesia in a pig model 2002;95:1772–6. table of contents, https://doi. org/10.1097/00000539-200212000-00057.
- [8] Koo CH, Park EY, Lee SY, Ryu JH. The effects of intraoperative inspired oxygen fraction on postoperative pulmonary parameters in patients with general anesthesia: a systemic review and meta-analysis. J Clin Med 2019;8. https://doi. org/10.3390/jcm8050583.
- [9] Khan NA, Quan H, Bugar JM, Lemaire JB, Brant R, Ghali WA. Association of postoperative complications with hospital costs and length of stay in a tertiary care center. J Gen Intern Med 2006;21:177–80. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.00319.x.
- [10] van Kaam AH, Lachmann RA, Herting E, De Jaegere A, van Iwaarden F, Noorduyn LA, et al. Reducing atelectasis attenuates bacterial growth and translocation in experimental pneumonia. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2004;169: 1046–53. https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.200312-1779OC.
- [11] Zheng-Pywell R, Chu DI. Postoperative complications. In: Doherty GM, editor. Current diagnosis & treatment: surgery. 15th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill; 2020.
- [12] Staehr-Rye AK, Meyhoff CS, Scheffenbichler FT, Vidal Melo MF, Gätke MR, Walsh JL, et al. High intraoperative inspiratory oxygen fraction and risk of major respiratory complications. Br J Anaesth 2017;119:140–9. https://doi.org/ 10.1093/bja/aex128.

- [13] Chu DK, Kim LH, Young PJ, Zamiri N, Almenawer SA, Jaeschke R, et al. Mortality and morbidity in acutely ill adults treated with liberal versus conservative oxygen therapy (IOTA): a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet 2018;391: 1693–705. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(18)30479-3.
- [14] Mattishent K, Thavarajah M, Sinha A, Peel A, Egger M, Solomkin J, et al. Safety of 80% vs 30-35% fraction of inspired oxygen in patients undergoing surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Anaesth 2019;122:311–24. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.bja.2018.11.026.
- [15] Kurz A, Kopyeva T, Suliman I, Podolyak A, You J, Lewis B, et al. Supplemental oxygen and surgical-site infections: an alternating intervention controlled trial. Br J Anaesth 2018;120:117–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2017.11.003.
- [16] de Jonge S, Egger M, Latif A, Loke YK, Berenholtz S, Boermeester M, et al. Effectiveness of 80% vs 30-35% fraction of inspired oxygen in patients undergoing surgery: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Anaesth 2019;122: 325–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2018.11.024.
- [17] Hovaguimian F, Lysakowski C, Elia N, Tramèr MR. Effect of intraoperative high inspired oxygen fraction on surgical site infection, postoperative nausea and vomiting, and pulmonary function: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Anesthesiology 2013;119:303–16. https://doi.org/ 10.1097/ALN.0b013e31829aaff4.
- [18] Chura JC, Boyd A, Argenta PA. Surgical site infections and supplemental perioperative oxygen in colorectal surgery patients: a systematic review. Surg Infect (Larchmt) 2007;8:455–61. https://doi.org/10.1089/sur.2006.034.
- [19] Orhan-Sungur M, Kranke P, Sessler D, Apfel CC. Does supplemental oxygen reduce postoperative nausea and vomiting? A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Anesth Analg 2008;106:1733–8. https://doi.org/10.1213/ ane.0b013e3181731c5a.
- [20] Qadan M, Akça O, Mahid SS, Hornung CA, Polk Jr HC. Perioperative supplemental oxygen therapy and surgical site infection: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Arch Surg 2009;144:359–66. discussion 66-7, https://doi.org/1 0.1001/archsurg.2009.1.
- [21] Togioka B, Galvagno S, Sumida S, Murphy J, Ouanes JP, Wu C. The role of perioperative high inspired oxygen therapy in reducing surgical site infection: a meta-analysis. Anesth Analg 2012;114:334–42. https://doi.org/10.1213/ ANE.0b013e31823fada8.
- [22] McKeen DM, Arellano R, O'Connell C. Supplemental oxygen does not prevent postoperative nausea and vomiting after gynecological laparoscopy. Can J Anaesth 2009;56:651–7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12630-009-9136-4.
- [23] Wetterslev J, Meyhoff CS, Jørgensen LN, Gluud C, Lindschou J, Rasmussen LS. The effects of high perioperative inspiratory oxygen fraction for adult surgical patients. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2015;2015:Cd008884. https://doi.org/10.1002/ 14651858.CD008884.pub2.
- [24] Smith BK, Roberts RH, Frizelle FA. O(2) no longer the go(2): a systematic review and meta-analysis comparing the effects of giving perioperative oxygen therapy of 30% FiO(2) to 80% FiO(2) on surgical site infection and mortality. World J Surg 2020;44:69–77. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-019-05224-3.
- [25] Brar MS, Brar SS, Dixon E. Perioperative supplemental oxygen in colorectal patients: a meta-analysis. J Surg Res 2011;166:227–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. jss.2009.06.007.
- [26] Sun R, Jia WQ, Zhang P, Yang K, Tian JH, Ma B, et al. Nitrous oxide-based techniques versus nitrous oxide-free techniques for general anaesthesia. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2015:CD008984.
- [27] Myles PS, Leslie K, Chan MT, Forbes A, Paech MJ, Peyton P, et al. Avoidance of nitrous oxide for patients undergoing major surgery: a randomized controlled trial. Anesthesiology 2007;107:221–31. https://doi.org/10.1097/01. anesc.0000270723 30772 da
- [28] Pelosi P, Croci M, Ravagnan I, Cerisara M, Vicardi P, Lissoni A, et al. Respiratory system mechanics in sedated, paralyzed, morbidly obese patients. J Appl Physiol 1997;82:811–8. https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1997.82.3.811.
- [29] Reinius H, Jonsson L, Gustafsson S, Sundbom M, Duvernoy O, Pelosi P, et al. Prevention of atelectasis in morbidly obese patients during general anesthesia and paralysis: a computerized tomography study. Anesthesiology 2009;111:979–87. https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0b013e3181b87edb.
- [30] Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. J Clin Epidemiol 2009;62:1006–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.005.
- [31] Jammer I, Wickboldt N, Sander M, Smith A, Schultz MJ, Pelosi P, et al. Standards for definitions and use of outcome measures for clinical effectiveness research in perioperative medicine: European perioperative clinical outcome (EPCO) definitions: a statement from the ESA-ESICM joint taskforce on perioperative outcome measures. Eur J Anaesthesiol 2015;32:88–105. https://doi.org/10.1097/ eja.000000000000118.
- [32] Wan X, Wang W, Liu J, Tong T. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range. BMC Med Res Methodol 2014;14:135. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-14-135.
- [33] Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. Bmj 2008;336:924–6. https://doi.org/10.1136/ bmj.39489.470347.AD.
- [34] Staehr AK, Meyhoff CS, Rasmussen LS. Inspiratory oxygen fraction and postoperative complications in obese patients: a subgroup analysis of the PROXI trial. Anesthesiology 2011;114:1313–9. https://doi.org/10.1097/ ALN.0b013e31821bdb82.
- [35] Greif R, Laciny S, Rapf B, Hickle RS, Sessler DI. Supplemental oxygen reduces the incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting. Anesthesiology 1999;91:1246–52. https://doi.org/10.1097/0000542-199911000-00014.

#### C.-H. Lim et al.

- [36] Lim YJ, Seo YJ, Jung SM, Yang HS. The effect of increased FIO2 before removal of the laryngeal mask airway on postanesthetic arterial partial oxygen pressure. Korean J Anesthesiol 2005;48:576–81.
- [37] Eskandr AM, Atallah HA, Sadik SA, Mohamemd MS. The effect of inspired oxygen concentration on postoperative pulmonary atelectasis in obese patients undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy: a randomized-controlled double-blind study. Res Opin Anesth Intens Care 2019;6:287–93. https://doi.org/10.4103/roaic.roaic\_40\_ 18.
- [38] Park J, Lee EK, Lee JH, Oh EJ, Min JJ. Effects of inspired oxygen concentration during emergence from general anaesthesia on postoperative lung impedance changes evaluated by electrical impedance tomography: a randomised controlled trial. J Clin Monit Comput 2020;34:995–1004. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10877-019-00390-0.
- [39] Akça O, Podolsky A, Eisenhuber E, Panzer O, Hetz H, Lampl K, et al. Comparable postoperative pulmonary atelectasis in patients given 30% or 80% oxygen during and 2 hours after colon resection. Anesthesiology 1999;91:991–8. https://doi.org/ 10.1097/00000542-199910000-00019.
- [40] Benoît Z, Wicky S, Fischer JF, Frascarolo P, Chapuis C, Spahn DR, et al. The effect of increased FIO(2) before tracheal extubation on postoperative atelectasis. Anesth Analg 2002;95:1777–81. https://doi.org/10.1097/00000539-200212000-00058.
- [41] Edmark L, Auner U, Lindbäck J, Enlund M, Hedenstierna G. Post-operative atelectasis - a randomised trial investigating a ventilatory strategy and low oxygen fraction during recovery. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand 2014;58:681–8. https://doi.org/ 10.1111/aas.12322.
- [42] Kleinsasser AT, Pircher I, Truebsbach S, Knotzer H, Loeckinger A, Treml B. Pulmonary function after emergence on 100% oxygen in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a randomized, controlled trial. Anesthesiology 2014;120:1146–51. https://doi.org/10.1097/aln.000000000000161.
- [43] Chen Y, Liu X, Cheng CH, Gin T, Leslie K, Myles P, et al. Leukocyte DNA damage and wound infection after nitrous oxide administration: a randomized controlled trial. Anesthesiology 2013;118:1322–31. https://doi.org/10.1097/ ALN.0b013e31829107b8.
- [44] Kurz A, Fleischmann E, Sessler DI, Buggy DJ, Apfel C, Akça O. Effects of supplemental oxygen and dexamethasone on surgical site infection: a factorial randomized trial. Br J Anaesth 2015;115:434–43. https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/ aev062.
- [45] Kotani N, Hashimoto H, Sessler DJ, Muraoka M, Hashiba E, Kubota T, et al. Supplemental intraoperative oxygen augments antimicrobial and proinflammatory responses of alveolar macrophages. Anesthesiology 2000;93:15–25. https://doi. org/10.1097/00000542-200007000-00008.
- [46] Renner M, Hohlrieder M, Wölk T, Pühringer F, Kleinsasser AT, Keller C, et al. Administration of 100% oxygen before removal of the laryngeal mask airway does not affect postanesthetic arterial partial pressure of oxygen. Anesth Anal 2004;98: 257–9.
- [47] Zoremba M, Dette F, Hunecke T, Braunecker S, Wulf H. The influence of perioperative oxygen concentration on postoperative lung function in moderately obese adults. Eur J Anaesthesiol 2010;27:501–7. https://doi.org/10.1097/ EJA.0b013e32832e08c3.
- [48] Belda FJ, Aguilera L, García de la Asunción J, Alberti J, Vicente R, Ferrándiz L, et al. Supplemental perioperative oxygen and the risk of surgical wound infection: a randomized controlled trial. Jama 2005;294:2035–42. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.294.16.2035.
- [49] Stall A, Paryavi E, Gupta R, Zadnik M, Hui E, O'Toole RV. Perioperative supplemental oxygen to reduce surgical site infection after open fixation of highrisk fractures: a randomized controlled pilot trial. J Trauma Acute Care Surg 2013; 75:657–63. https://doi.org/10.1097/TA.0b013e3182a1fe83.
- [50] Mackintosh N, Gertsch MC, Hopf HW, Pace NL, White J, Morris R, et al. High intraoperative inspired oxygen does not increase postoperative supplemental oxygen requirements. J Am Soc Anesthesiol 2012;117:271–9.
- [51] Greif R, Akca O, Horn EP, Kurz A, Sessler DI, Outcomes Research G. Supplemental perioperative oxygen to reduce the incidence of surgical-wound infection. N Engl J Med 2000;342:161–7. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM200001203420303.
- [52] Korkulu F, Uysal HY, Acar HV, Eruyar S, Dikmen B. The effect of different oxygen concentrations used for the induction and maintenance of anesthesia on gas exchange in the lungs. Turk J Anaesthesiol Reanim 2012;40:11–9. https://doi.org/ 10.5222/JTAICS.2012.011.

- [53] Nitin W, Jitendra Y, Arpit G, Sagar S. Role of supplemental oxygen in reducing surgical site infection in acute appendicities: our experience of sixty four cases. Int J Biomed Adv Res 2015;6:124–7.
- [54] Meyhoff CS, Wetterslev J, Jorgensen LN, Henneberg SW, Høgdall C, Lundvall L, et al. Effect of high perioperative oxygen fraction on surgical site infection and pulmonary complications after abdominal surgery: the PROXI randomized clinical trial. Jama 2009;302:1543–50. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2009.1452.
- [55] Joyce CJ, Baker AB, Chartres S. Influence of inspired nitrogen concentration during anaesthesia for coronary artery bypass grafting on postoperative atelectasis. Br J Anaesth 1995;75:422–7. https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/75.4.422.
- [56] Kim BR, Lee S, Bae H, Lee M, Bahk JH, Yoon S. Lung ultrasound score to determine the effect of fraction inspired oxygen during alveolar recruitment on absorption atelectasis in laparoscopic surgery: a randomized controlled trial. BMC Anesthesiol 2020;20:173. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12871-020-01090-y.
- [57] Shaefi S, Shankar P, Mueller AL, O'Gara BP, Spear K, Khabbaz KR, et al. Intraoperative oxygen concentration and neurocognition after cardiac surgery. Anesthesiology 2021;134:189–201. https://doi.org/10.1097/ aln.000000000003650.
- [58] Ferrando C, Aldecoa C, Unzueta C, Belda FJ, Librero J, Tusman G, et al. Effects of oxygen on post-surgical infections during an individualised perioperative openlung ventilatory strategy: a randomised controlled trial. Br J Anaesth 2020;124: 110–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2019.10.009.
- [59] Li XF, Jiang D, Jiang YL, Yu H, Zhang MQ, Jiang JL, et al. Comparison of low and high inspiratory oxygen fraction added to lung-protective ventilation on postoperative pulmonary complications after abdominal surgery: a randomized controlled trial. J Clin Anesth 2020;67:110009. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. jclinane.2020.110009.
- [60] Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. Bmj 2019;366:14898. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.14898.
- [61] Meyhoff CS, Jorgensen LN, Wetterslev J, Christensen KB, Rasmussen LS. Increased long-term mortality after a high perioperative inspiratory oxygen fraction during abdominal surgery: follow-up of a randomized clinical trial. Anesth Analg 2012; 115:849–54. https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0b013e3182652a51.
- [62] Hopf HW, Holm J. Hyperoxia and infection. Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol 2008; 22:553–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpa.2008.06.001.
- [63] Tertil M, Jozkowicz A, Dulak J. Oxidative stress in tumor angiogenesis- therapeutic targets. Curr Pharm Des 2010;16:3877–94. https://doi.org/10.2174/ 138161210794454969.
- [64] De Bels D, Corazza F, Germonpré P, Balestra C. The normobaric oxygen paradox: a novel way to administer oxygen as an adjuvant treatment for cancer? Med Hypotheses 2011;76:467–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2010.11.022.
- [65] Podolyak A, Sessler DI, Reiterer C, Fleischmann E, Akça O, Mascha EJ, et al. Perioperative supplemental oxygen does not worsen long-term mortality of colorectal surgery patients. Anesth Analg 2016;122:1907–11. https://doi.org/ 10.1213/ane.00000000001316.
- [66] Mavros MN, Velmahos GC, Falagas ME. Atelectasis as a cause of postoperative fever: where is the clinical evidence? Chest 2011;140:418–24. https://doi.org/ 10.1378/chest.11-0127.
- [67] Crompton JG, Crompton PD, Matzinger P. Does atelectasis cause fever after surgery? Putting a damper on dogma. JAMA Surg 2019;154:375–6. https://doi. org/10.1001/jamasurg.2018.5645.
- [68] Inai Y, Nomura Y, Takarada T, Hanada N, Wada N. Risk factors for postoperative pneumonia according to examination findings before surgery under general anesthesia. Clin Oral Investig 2020;24:3577–85. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-020-03230-7.
- [69] Russotto V, Sabaté S, Canet J. Development of a prediction model for postoperative pneumonia: a multicentre prospective observational study. Eur J Anaesthesiol 2019;36:93–104. https://doi.org/10.1097/eja.000000000000921.
- [70] Hedenstierna G, Tokics L, Reinius H, Rothen HU, Östberg E, Öhrvik J. Higher age and obesity limit atelectasis formation during anaesthesia: an analysis of computed tomography data in 243 subjects. Br J Anaesth 2020;124:336–44. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.bja.2019.11.026.
- [71] Abbott TEF, Fowler AJ, Pelosi P, Gama de Abreu M, Møller AM, Canet J, et al. A systematic review and consensus definitions for standardised end-points in perioperative medicine: pulmonary complications. Br J Anaesth 2018;120: 1066–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2018.02.007.