

# Introduction

- Fresh gas flow (FGF), a term used to describe the flow rate of Oxygen or the combination of Oxygen and medical air that circulates through an anesthesia circuit, can dictate various details regarding the delivery of anesthesia
- FGF, set by the anesthesia provider, effects the amount of Sevoflurane, a commonly used inhaled anesthetic, needed to anesthetize a patient
- According to the package insert, Sevoflurane should be run with a gas flow of no more than 1-1.5 L/min. Flows higher



than 2 L/min are both costly and unnecessary

### **Background and Implications**

- There is a common misconception amongst anesthesia providers that the technique of low flow anesthesia used in combination with Sevoflurane can contribute to the accumulation of Compound A in the body
- Compound A has only been found to have nephrotoxic properties in rats. This has never been proven to cause adverse effects in humans under the concept of low fresh gas flow during the first two hours of Sevoflurane administration
- Excessively high fresh gas flows are associated with a large increase in cost amongst other negative outcomes
- Facilities across the country have begun to encourage the implementation of low flow anesthesia amongst providers

**Problem**: A common misconception among anesthesia providers is that Sevoflurane is best ran in conjunction with a fresh gas flow of at least 2 L/min

**Result in this practice:** Excessive use of sevoflurane with a great deal of economic impact

**Goal:** Educate providers of current recommendations when administering Sevoflurane and encourage a change in practice to reduce overall cost and waste of Sevoflurane

# Utilization of Low-flow Anesthesia in Conjunction with Sevoflurane for Anesthesia Providers

William Bogdon BSN, RN, RRNA & Cori Kutzin BSN, RN, RRNA DNP Chair: Michael McLaughlin DNP, CRNA/APN, DNP Team Member: Thomas Pallaria DNP, CRNA/APN

# Methodology

### **Study Design:** Quasi-experimental

- Pre-intervention data collection period: Observe fresh gas flow rate, device utilized and title of the administering provider during the maintenance phase of general anesthesia with Sevoflurane
  - Duration: 4 weeks
  - A small reminder card was placed on each
- Target population: 25 procedures Intervention: Anesthesia providers were offered a PowerPoint presentation during their monthly meeting regarding the low flow anesthesia technique
  - anesthesia machine
- Post-Intervention observational data collection period Completed at 1- and 4-weeks following
  - intervention
  - Duration: 1 week
  - Target population: 25 procedures
- Reinforcement educational PowerPoint Completed at 6 weeks following intervention Repeat Post-Intervention observational data collection
- period
  - 2 weeks following reinforcement education
  - Duration: 1 week
  - Target population: 25 procedures

## Results

### **Pre-Intervention**

Data points included: 49 Average FGF: 3.5 L/min Min: 2 L/min Max: 5.8 L/min

Data points included: 17 Average FGF: 2.2 L/min Min: 1.4 L/min Max: 5 L/min

Four week **Post-Intervention** Data points included: 8 Average FGF: 1.6 L/min Min: 1 L/min Max: 2 L/min



### One week **Post-Intervention**

**Eight week Post-Intervention** Data points included: 22 Average FGF: 2.3 L/min Min: 1 L/min Max: 4 L/min



		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Flow Rate Utilized	Based on Mean	2.463	3	92	.067
	Based on Median	2.692	3	92	.051
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2.692	3	77.167	.052
	Based on trimmed mean	2.480	3	92	.066

- each group
- variation between each group
- degree of variation between each group

Flow Rate Utilized

	Sum of Squares	d f	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	47.759	3	15.920	16.032	<.001
Within Groups	91.355	92	.993		
Total	139.114	95			

- of <.001
- The Welch and Brown-Forsythe tests of equality of means were also conducted yielding a significance value of <.001 All three tests support the concept of statistical significance within means of each group
- Results determined that education in the utilization of low flow anesthesia in conjunction with Sevoflurane was helpful in decreasing flow rates utilized by providers
- Some providers may have regressed to previously formed practice techniques, whether conscious or subconscious, which could explain the results of this project
- With reinforcement and the continuous presence of a reminder sign, an overall change in practice was displayed amongst providers



# **Statistical Analysis**

### Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

• Levene's Test: Utilized to compare the degree of variation within

• Assumes a null hypothesis that there is no significant degree of

• With a significance value >0.05, there is no statistically significant

### ANOVA

• A one-way ANOVA test was conducted yielding a significance value

### Discussion

One may assume that with a continuation of prompts and reinforcement education, this practice change has the potential to become the new standard amongst providers

# **Contact Information** William Bogdon wjb118@sn.Rutgers.edu Cori Kutzin Kutzin@sn.Rutgers.edu