Contents lists available at ScienceDirect







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

## Are respiratory rate counters really so bad? Throwing the baby out with the bath water

J Mark Ansermino<sup>a,\*</sup>, Dustin Dunsmuir<sup>a</sup>, Walter Karlen<sup>b</sup>, Heng Gan<sup>c</sup>, Guy A Dumont<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The University of British Columbia, British Columbia Children's Hospital Research Institute, V6H 3V4, Canada

<sup>b</sup> ETH Zurich, Mobile Health Systems Lab, Institute of Robotics and Intelligent Systems, Department of Health Sciences and Technology, BAA, Lengghalde 5,

8092 Zurich, Switzerland

<sup>c</sup> Department of Anesthesia, British Columbia Children's Hospital, Vancouver BC V6H 3V4, Canada

## ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 16 July 2019 Accepted 23 September 2019 Available online 25 October 2019

We congratulate Baker et al. [1] on their bold attempt to evaluate respiratory rate counters. However, their data show significant variability and wide limits of agreement with all devices which are much greater than reported in previous studies. The gross errors (>30 breaths/ minute) are much more likely due to artifacts in the reference capnometer device or the lack of breath identification by the observer than test device performance.

We strongly support the use of capnography as a reference device for respiratory rate measurement. However, this invasive procedure introduces many additional risks. The difficulty of using capnography in awake children is reflected in the fact that one quarter of observations were withdrawn [1]. Capnometers measure respiratory rate by detecting the presence of exhaled carbon dioxide ( $CO_2$ ) in each breath [2]. The magnitude, regularity and shape of the  $CO_2$  waveform must be used to confirm the rate [3]. This is especially important in small children with rapid breathing rates and small tidal volumes which result in dilution of the end tidal gas. Expert observer counting and analysis of sequential observations from each observer should help in identifying the cause of these gross errors.

The inability to identify a breath should be considered less a failure of the device and more of the observer.

The clinical measurement of respiratory rate is widely used in clinical diagnosis in children. Until the performance of automated counters have been established, the use of respiratory rate counters should not be discarded based on this study alone.

## **Declaration of Competing Interest**

The authors are the inventors of the RRate app. that has been evaluated by Baker et al.

## References

- [1] Baker K, Alfvén T, Mucunguzi A, Wharton-smith A, Dantzer E, Habte T, et al. Performance of four respiratory rate counters to support community health workers to detect the symptoms of pneumonia in children in low resource settings: a prospective, multicentre, hospital-based, single-blinded, comparative trial. EClinicalMedicine 2019 preprint. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2019.05.013.
- [2] Eipe N, Doherty DR. A review of pediatric capnography. J Clin Monit Comput. 2010;24(4):261–8 Aug.
- [3] Krauss B, Hess DR. Capnography for procedural sedation and analgesia in the emergency department. Ann Emerg Med 2007;50(2):272–81.

\* Corresponding author.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2019.09.013

2589-5370/© 2019 Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license. (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

*E-mail addresses:* anserminos@yahoo.ca (J.M. Ansermino), DDunsmuir@cw.bc.ca (D. Dunsmuir), walter.karlen@ieee.org (W. Karlen), Heng.Gan@cw.bc.ca (H. Gan), guyd@ece.ubc.ca (G.A. Dumont).