

NAVA® AND EDI MONITORING BETTER PATIENT SATISFACTION THROUGH BETTER BREATHING

Patient satisfaction is tied to hospital reimbursement. In 2012, 30% of Medicare reimbursement will be attributed to patient satisfaction scores, with a first-year calculation estimated at \$850M going to hospitals with the highest scores.¹

Patient satisfaction can decrease due to the high level of asynchrony that is exhibited in 25% of the mechanically ventilated patients in the ICU.²

MECHANICAL VENTILATION FACTS – ASYNCHRONY

- Ineffective triggering is associated with patient sleep impairment, discomfort, anxiety, and fear.³
- Diaphragmatic dysfunction is common in mechanically ventilated patients and is a likely cause of weaning failure.⁴
- Patient discomfort increases with asynchrony.⁵

NAVA reduces trigger delays by 61% to 65%.⁶

NAVA (Neurally Adjusted Ventilatory Assist) helps improve synchrony for mechanically ventilated patients. By monitoring diaphragmatic electrical activity (Edi), NAVA therapy with Edi Monitoring has been shown to improve patient/ventilator synchrony — even in complicated patient cases.⁶

NAVA THERAPY FACTS – IMPROVED SYNCHRONY AND ENHANCED MONITORING

- NAVA is associated with improved patient/ventilator synchrony.⁷
- NAVA improves sleep quality compared to pressure support ventilation (PSV) with regard to REM sleep.⁸
- Edi monitoring provides assurance that diaphragm disuse is minimized, which may potentially reduce the risk of ventilator-induced diaphragmatic dysfunction (VIDD).
- “Monitoring diaphragm electrical activity comes closest to representing the ideal in ventilator monitoring.”⁹
- NAVA improves patient comfort.¹⁰



**LEARN MORE ABOUT HOW NAVA CAN ASSIST YOU TODAY.
CONTACT YOUR MAQUET REPRESENTATIVE.**

www.maquetusa.com

References

1. Rau J. Medicare To Begin Basing Hospital Payments On Patient-Satisfaction Scores. *Kaiser Health News*. 2011.
2. Thille AW, Rodriguez P, Cabello B, et al. Patient-ventilator asynchrony during assisted mechanical ventilation. *Intensive Care Med*. 2006 Oct;32(10):1515-22.
3. de Wit M, Miller KB, Green DA, et al. Ineffective triggering effects predicts increased duration of mechanical ventilation. *Crit Care Med*. 2009 Oct;37(10):2740-5.
4. Petrof BJ, Jaber S, Matecki S. Ventilator-induced diaphragm dysfunction. *Curr Opin Crit Care*. 2010 Feb;16(1):19-25.
5. Vitacca M, Bianchi L, Zanotti E, et al. Assessment of physiologic variables and subjective comfort under different levels of pressure support ventilation. *Chest*. 2004 Sep;126(3):851-9.
6. Piquilloud L, Vignaux L, Bialais E, et al. Neurally adjusted ventilatory assist improves patient-ventilator interaction. *Intensive Care Med*. 2011 Feb;37(2):263-71.
7. Colombo D, Cammarota G, Bergamaschi V, et al. Physiologic response to varying levels of pressure support and neurally adjusted ventilatory assist in patients with acute respiratory failure. *Intensive Care Med*. 2008 Nov;34(11):2010-8.
8. Delisle S, Ouellet P, Bellemare P, et al. Sleep quality in mechanically ventilated patients: comparison between NAVA and PSV modes. *Ann Intensive Care*. 2011 Sep 28;1(1):42.
9. Unroe M, MacIntyre N. Evolving approaches to assessing and monitoring patient-ventilator interactions. *Curr Opin Crit Care*. 2010 Jun;16(3):261-8.
10. de la Oliva P, Schüffelmann C, Gómez-Zamora A, et al. Asynchrony, neural drive, ventilatory variability and comfort: NAVA versus pressure support in pediatric patients. *Intensive Care Med*. 2012 May;38(5):838-46.