High-Flow Nasal Cannula Therapy: Mechanisms, Clinical Applications, And Outcomes In Adult Acute Hypoxemic Respiratory Failure

Othman Alsantely[1] , Wejdan mashaan Almutairi[2] , Aljwharah bander Almutairi[3]

[1,2,3]Respiratory therapy.

Abstract

High-flow nasal cannula (HFNC) therapy has emerged as a pivotal intervention in respiratory care, bridging the gap between conventional oxygen therapy and invasive mechanical ventilation. This paper examines the physiological mechanisms underlying HFNC effectiveness, reviews current evidence for its clinical applications in acute hypoxemic respiratory failure, and analyzes patient outcomes compared to traditional oxygen delivery methods. A comprehensive literature review reveals that HFNC provides superior oxygenation through multiple mechanisms including positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) effect, dead space washout, and consistent FiO_2 delivery. Clinical evidence demonstrates reduced intubation rates and improved patient comfort in selected populations. However, careful patient selection and monitoring remain essential to prevent delayed intubation in deteriorating patients. This paper provides evidence-based recommendations for respiratory therapists implementing HFNC in acute care settings.

Keywords: high-flow nasal cannula, acute hypoxemic respiratory failure, respiratory therapy, non-invasive ventilation, oxygenation.

Introduction

Acute hypoxemic respiratory failure represents a common and life-threatening condition encountered in critical care settings, affecting approximately 15% of hospitalized patients (Bellani et al., 2016). Traditional oxygen delivery systems, including nasal cannulas and face masks, often prove insufficient for patients with moderate to severe hypoxemia, necessitating escalation to invasive mechanical ventilation with its associated complications including ventilator-associated pneumonia, barotrauma, and prolonged intensive care unit (ICU) stays (Slutsky & Ranieri, 2013).

High-flow nasal cannula (HFNC) therapy has revolutionized respiratory care by providing an intermediate option that delivers heated, humidified oxygen at flows up to 60 liters per minute through specialized nasal prongs. Since its introduction into clinical practice in the early 2000s, HFNC has gained widespread adoption across critical care, emergency, and general medical units (Nishimura, 2016). Unlike conventional oxygen therapy limited to 15 liters per minute, HFNC's capacity to deliver higher flows with precise oxygen concentrations (21-100% FiO_2) while maintaining optimal humidification has demonstrated significant physiological and clinical advantages.

The growing body of evidence supporting HFNC utilization has prompted respiratory therapists to refine their approach to managing acute hypoxemic respiratory failure. Understanding the mechanisms underlying HFNC effectiveness, identifying appropriate patient populations, and recognizing failure indicators are essential competencies for modern respiratory care practitioners. This paper synthesizes current evidence regarding HFNC therapy, providing a comprehensive resource for respiratory therapists managing patients with acute hypoxemic respiratory failure.

Physiological Mechanisms of HFNC

Positive End-Expiratory Pressure Effect

HFNC generates positive airway pressure through continuous high-velocity gas flow, creating a PEEP-like effect that improves alveolar recruitment and functional residual capacity. Parke et al. (2011) demonstrated that HFNC at 35-40 L/min produces mean nasopharyngeal pressures of 2-3 cm H_2O with closed mouth breathing, increasing to 5-7 cm H_2O when patients close their mouths. This modest PEEP effect contributes to improved oxygenation by preventing alveolar collapse during expiration and recruiting previously collapsed alveoli.

The magnitude of PEEP generated varies with flow rate, with higher flows producing proportionally greater positive pressure. Groves and Tobin (2007) found a linear relationship between flow rate and generated pressure, with each 10 L/min increase corresponding to approximately 0.5-1.0 cm H_2O pressure rise. While substantially lower than pressures achieved through non-invasive ventilation (typically 5-15 cm H_2O), this modest

PEEP proves sufficient for many patients with mild to moderate hypoxemic respiratory failure.

Dead Space Washout

High-flow gas delivery continuously flushes the nasopharyngeal space, washing out carbon dioxide-rich expired gas and reducing anatomical dead space. This mechanism, first described by Möller et al. (2017), improves alveolar ventilation efficiency by ensuring that fresh gas reaches the lower airways with each breath. The nasopharynx typically contains approximately 50 mL of dead space; by clearing this volume, HFNC effectively increases alveolar minute ventilation without requiring increased respiratory effort from the patient.

This washout effect proves particularly beneficial for patients with elevated work of breathing, as it reduces the ventilatory demand required to maintain adequate carbon dioxide elimination. Studies using volumetric capnography have demonstrated that HFNC reduces end-tidal to arterial CO_2 gradients, suggesting improved ventilation-perfusion matching (Dysart et al., 2009).

Consistent FiO_2 Delivery

Unlike conventional oxygen systems where delivered FiO_2 varies with patient inspiratory demand, HFNC provides stable oxygen concentrations regardless of breathing pattern. When inspiratory flow rates exceed oxygen delivery rates in conventional systems, room air entrainment dilutes the inspired oxygen concentration, resulting in unpredictable and often suboptimal oxygenation (Wettstein et al., 2005).

HFNC overcomes this limitation by delivering flows that typically exceed patient inspiratory demands, even during respiratory distress. This flow supremacy ensures that the set FiO_2 closely approximates the delivered FiO_2, providing predictable and titratable oxygenation. Ritchie et al. (2011) confirmed this principle through bench studies demonstrating that HFNC maintains target FiO_2 within 5% of set values across varying respiratory patterns.

Heated Humidification

Adequate humidification represents a critical yet often underappreciated component of HFNC therapy. Medical gases are typically dry, and conventional oxygen delivery systems provide minimal humidification, leading to airway desiccation, impaired mucociliary clearance, and patient discomfort (Williams et al., 1996). HFNC systems incorporate active heated humidifiers that deliver gas at body temperature (37°C) with 100% relative humidity, maintaining optimal conditions for airway function.

Optimal humidification preserves mucociliary function, reduces airway inflammation, and improves patient tolerance of high-flow therapy. Dysart et al. (2009) demonstrated that heated humidification significantly reduces respiratory effort and improves comfort scores compared to non-humidified high-flow systems. Additionally, adequate humidification prevents the compensatory increase in metabolic demand that occurs when the respiratory system must heat and humidify inspired gas.

Clinical Applications and Evidence

Acute Hypoxemic Respiratory Failure

The landmark FLORALI trial, conducted by Frat et al. (2015), established HFNC as a first-line therapy for acute hypoxemic respiratory failure. This multicenter randomized controlled trial compared HFNC, conventional oxygen therapy, and non-invasive ventilation in 310 patients with PaO_2/FiO_2 ratios below 300 mmHg. The primary outcome, intubation rate at 28 days, was lowest in the HFNC group (38%) compared to conventional oxygen (47%) and non-invasive ventilation (50%). Notably, the HFNC group demonstrated significantly improved 90-day survival (25% mortality) compared to conventional oxygen therapy (38% mortality, p=0.02).

Subsequent meta-analyses have confirmed these findings across diverse patient populations. Rochwerg et al. (2019) analyzed 13 randomized controlled trials involving 2,781 patients and found that HFNC reduced intubation rates compared to conventional oxygen therapy (risk ratio 0.85, 95% CI 0.74-0.99) with trends toward reduced mortality, though not reaching statistical significance across all studies. The greatest benefits appeared in patients with moderate hypoxemia (PaO_2/FiO_2 200-300 mmHg), while severely hypoxemic patients (PaO_2/FiO_2 <200 mmHg) often required escalation to invasive ventilation.

Post-Extubation Respiratory Support

HFNC has demonstrated particular efficacy in preventing reintubation following planned extubation, especially in high-risk populations. Hernández et al. (2016) conducted a randomized trial involving 604 patients at high risk for extubation failure, defined by age >65 years, cardiac failure, moderate-to-severe COPD, or prolonged ventilation. HFNC reduced reintubation rates (13.8% vs 19.1%, p=0.048) and post-extubation respiratory failure (14.5% vs 21.1%, p=0.014) compared to conventional oxygen therapy.

The mechanisms underlying HFNC's success in this population likely involve multiple factors: the PEEP effect helps maintain lung recruitment achieved during mechanical ventilation, dead space washout reduces post-extubation respiratory effort, and improved humidification facilitates secretion clearance during a vulnerable period when patients are relearning to cough effectively.

Immunocompromised Patients
Patients with hematological malignancies or those undergoing hematopoietic stem cell transplantation face particularly high mortality when requiring invasive mechanical ventilation, with reported mortality rates exceeding 50% (Azoulay et al., 2013). For these patients, avoiding intubation becomes paramount. Lemiale et al. (2015) studied 82 immunocompromised patients with acute respiratory failure and found that HFNC was associated with lower intubation rates (46% vs 66%, p=0.03) and improved ICU survival compared to conventional oxygen therapy or non-invasive ventilation.

The success of HFNC in immunocompromised populations may relate to improved tolerance and comfort, allowing earlier implementation and longer duration of therapy compared to non-invasive ventilation, which requires tight-fitting interfaces that many patients find claustrophobic or uncomfortable.

Patient Selection and Monitoring

Ideal Candidates for HFNC
Evidence suggests optimal outcomes occur when HFNC is implemented early in patients with moderate hypoxemic respiratory failure who retain spontaneous ventilatory effort. Ideal candidates typically present with:

- PaO_2/FiO_2 ratio between 200-300 mmHg
- Respiratory rate 20-30 breaths per minute
- Hemodynamic stability without vasopressor requirements
- Preserved consciousness and ability to protect airway
- Absence of immediate need for intubation

Patients with pure hypoxemic respiratory failure (such as pneumonia or acute respiratory distress syndrome) tend to respond better than those with hypercapnic respiratory failure, where non-invasive ventilation with bilevel positive airway pressure may prove superior (Rochwerg et al., 2019).

Failure Recognition and Escalation Criteria
While HFNC provides significant benefits, delayed recognition of treatment failure and postponed intubation can worsen outcomes. Kang et al. (2015) identified that patients requiring intubation after prolonged HFNC trials (>48 hours) had significantly higher mortality than those intubated earlier. This finding emphasizes the importance of systematic monitoring for HFNC failure indicators.

The ROX index, developed by Roca et al. (2016), provides an objective tool for predicting HFNC success or failure. Calculated as (SpO_2/FiO_2)/respiratory rate, the ROX index demonstrates that values ≥4.88 at 12 hours predict HFNC success with 77% sensitivity and 83% specificity. Values <3.85 suggest high failure risk requiring close monitoring and consideration for intubation.

Additional failure indicators include:

- Persistent tachypnea (>30 breaths/minute) despite adequate FiO_2
- Increasing oxygen requirements beyond initial 6 hours
- Development or worsening of accessory muscle use
- Altered mental status or inability to cooperate with therapy
- Hemodynamic instability or worsening acidosis

Respiratory therapists must maintain vigilance for these indicators and communicate concerns promptly to the medical team to avoid dangerous delays in definitive airway management.

Practical Implementation for Respiratory Therapists

Initial Setup and Titration
Optimal HFNC implementation begins with appropriate equipment setup and patient education. Initial flow rates typically begin at 30-40 L/min for adults, with FiO_2 titrated to achieve SpO_2 92-96% for most patients or 88-92% for those with chronic hypercapnic respiratory failure (Mauri et al., 2017). The system should deliver gas at 37°C with 100% relative humidity to optimize comfort and airway function.

Patient positioning significantly influences HFNC effectiveness. Semi-recumbent positioning (30-45 degrees head elevation) optimizes lung mechanics and reduces aspiration risk. For patients with unilateral lung disease, positioning with the healthy lung dependent may improve oxygenation through gravitational effects on ventilation-perfusion matching.

Monitoring Parameters
Comprehensive monitoring forms the foundation of safe HFNC implementation. Essential parameters include:

Respiratory Assessment:

- Respiratory rate and pattern every 1-2 hours initially
- Accessory muscle use and signs of respiratory distress

- Patient comfort and tolerance
- Auscultation for secretion clearance

Oxygenation:

- Continuous pulse oximetry with appropriate alarm limits
- Serial arterial blood gases at 1, 6, and 24 hours
- ROX index calculation at 2, 6, and 12 hours

Clinical Status:

- Mental status and cooperation with therapy
- Hemodynamic parameters
- Work of breathing assessment

Documentation should include flow rate, FiO_2, inspired gas temperature, patient response, and any adjustments made. Trends over time prove more valuable than isolated measurements in predicting outcomes.

Troubleshooting Common Issues

Interface Discomfort: Nasal prong size significantly affects patient comfort and therapy effectiveness. Prongs should occlude approximately 50% of nare diameter—neither too loose (causing gas leak and reduced effectiveness) nor too tight (causing pressure ulcers). Alternating between different prong sizes or applying barrier dressings can prevent nasal injury during prolonged therapy.

Condensation in Circuit: While heated humidification is essential, excessive condensation can obstruct gas flow and cause discomfort. Ensuring appropriate temperature settings and using heated wire circuits minimizes condensation. The circuit should be positioned to allow drainage away from the patient.

Mouth Breathing: Patients who breathe predominantly through open mouths receive reduced PEEP effect, though oxygenation typically remains adequate due to maintained FiO_2 delivery and dead space washout. Gentle reminders to close the mouth or use of mouth gel to prevent dryness may help, though forcing mouth closure is unnecessary and may reduce patient comfort.

Comparison with Alternative Therapies

HFNC versus Non-Invasive Ventilation
Non-invasive ventilation (NIV) using bilevel positive airway pressure has traditionally served as first-line therapy for acute respiratory failure, particularly in hypercapnic exacerbations of COPD. However, HFNC offers distinct advantages in selected populations. Frat et al. (2015) found that patients with PaO_2/FiO_2 <200 mmHg treated with NIV had higher intubation rates (50%) compared to HFNC (38%), potentially due to intermittent application of NIV leading to periods of inadequate support.

HFNC provides continuous therapy without need for breaks, superior patient comfort, preserved ability to eat and communicate, and lower risk of gastric distension or aspiration (Rochwerg et al., 2019). However, NIV delivers higher and more reliable positive pressure support, making it preferable for hypercapnic respiratory failure where ventilatory support (not merely oxygenation) is needed.

HFNC versus Conventional Oxygen Therapy
Conventional oxygen therapy remains appropriate for patients with mild hypoxemia (PaO_2/FiO_2 >300 mmHg) responsive to lower oxygen flows. However, for moderate to severe hypoxemia, HFNC demonstrates clear superiority. The FLORALI trial (Frat et al., 2015) showed that conventional oxygen therapy was associated with higher intubation rates, increased ICU length of stay, and greater 90-day mortality compared to HFNC in patients with PaO_2/FiO_2 <300 mmHg.

Cost considerations favor conventional oxygen for mild disease, but the potential to avoid intubation and its complications makes HFNC cost-effective for moderate to severe hypoxemic respiratory failure (Gaunt et al., 2020). Respiratory therapists should advocate for early HFNC implementation in appropriate candidates rather than prolonged trials of inadequate conventional therapy.

Limitations and Contraindications
Despite its benefits, HFNC has important limitations and contraindications that respiratory therapists must recognize. Absolute contraindications include:

- Immediate need for intubation (cardiac arrest, severe hemodynamic instability, inability to protect airway)
- Facial trauma preventing interface placement
- Complete nasal obstruction
- Upper airway obstruction requiring definitive airway management

Relative contraindications requiring careful consideration include:

- Severe hypercapnic respiratory failure ($PaCO_2$ >60 mmHg with pH <7.25)
- Undrained pneumothorax
- Recent esophageal or upper airway surgery
- Severe hemodynamic instability requiring multiple vasopressors

Additionally, HFNC should not delay intubation when clinical deterioration indicates treatment failure. The false security of adequate oxygen saturation maintained by high FiO_2 can mask progressive respiratory failure, leading to emergent intubation under suboptimal conditions. Respiratory therapists must maintain high suspicion for failure and advocate for timely intubation when indicated.

Future Directions and Research Needs

Several areas require further investigation to optimize HFNC utilization:

Optimal Flow Rates: While most studies use flows of 30-50 L/min, whether higher flows provide additional benefit or whether personalized titration based on patient size and respiratory mechanics would improve outcomes remains unclear (Mauri et al., 2017).

Combined Therapies: Integration of HFNC with prone positioning for non-intubated patients shows promise in COVID-19 acute respiratory distress syndrome (Caputo et al., 2020), but optimal protocols require development.

Predictive Biomarkers: Beyond the ROX index, investigation of biomarkers or physiological measurements that predict HFNC success could enable earlier identification of patients requiring escalation.

Cost-Effectiveness: Comprehensive economic analyses comparing HFNC to alternatives across different healthcare systems would inform policy decisions regarding implementation.

Home and Long-Term Care: While this paper focuses on acute applications, emerging evidence suggests potential roles for HFNC in palliative care, home oxygen therapy, and rehabilitation settings that warrant investigation.

Conclusion

High-flow nasal cannula therapy represents a significant advancement in respiratory care, providing effective support for patients with acute hypoxemic respiratory failure through multiple physiological mechanisms. The evidence demonstrates reduced intubation rates, improved patient comfort, and potential mortality benefits compared to conventional oxygen therapy in appropriately selected patients.

Respiratory therapists play a crucial role in HFNC implementation, requiring expertise in patient selection, monitoring, troubleshooting, and failure recognition. Optimal outcomes depend on early initiation in suitable candidates, systematic monitoring using validated tools like the ROX index, and timely escalation when treatment proves inadequate.

As the evidence base continues to evolve, respiratory therapists must remain current with emerging research and refine their practice accordingly. HFNC should be viewed not as a universal solution but as one tool within a comprehensive approach to respiratory failure management, with success dependent on appropriate application, vigilant monitoring, and integration within multidisciplinary care teams.

The integration of HFNC into respiratory care practice exemplifies the evolution of the profession toward evidence-based interventions that improve patient outcomes. Continued research, education, and clinical refinement will further optimize this valuable therapy's role in managing acute respiratory failure.

References

1. Azoulay, E., Mokart, D., Pène, F., Lambert, J., Kouatchet, A., Mayaux, J., Vincent, F., Nyunga, M., Bruneel, F., Laisne, L. M., Rabbat, A., Lebert, C., Perez, P., Chaize, M., Renault, A., Meert, A. P., Benoit, D., Hamidfar, R., Jourdain, M., ... Schlemmer, B. (2013). Outcomes of critically ill patients with hematologic malignancies: Prospective multicenter data from France and Belgium—a groupe de recherche respiratoire en réanimation onco-hématologique study. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 31(22), 2810–2818. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2012.47.2365
2. Bellani, G., Laffey, J. G., Pham, T., Fan, E., Brochard, L., Esteban, A., Gattinoni, L., van Haren, F., Larsson, A., McAuley, D. F., Ranieri, M., Rubenfeld, G., Thompson, B. T., Wrigge, H., Slutsky, A. S., & Pesenti, A. (2016). Epidemiology, patterns of care, and mortality for patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome in intensive care units in 50 countries. JAMA, 315(8), 788–800. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.0291
3. Caputo, N. D., Strayer, R. J., & Levitan, R. (2020). Early self-proning in awake, non-intubated patients in the emergency department: A single ED's experience during the COVID-19 pandemic. Academic Emergency Medicine, 27(5), 375–378. https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.13994
4. Dysart, K., Miller, T. L., Wolfson, M. R., & Shaffer, T. H. (2009). Research in high flow therapy: Mechanisms of action. Respiratory Medicine, 103(10), 1400–1405. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2009.04.007
5. Frat, J. P., Thille, A. W., Mercat, A., Girault, C., Ragot, S., Perbet, S., Prat, G., Boulain, T., Morawiec, E., Cottereau, A., Devaquet, J., Nseir, S., Razazi, K., Mira, J. P., Argaud, L., Chakarian, J. C., Ricard, J. D., Wittebole, X., Chevalier, S., ... REVA Network. (2015). High-flow oxygen through nasal cannula in acute hypoxemic respiratory failure. New England Journal of

Medicine, 372(23), 2185–2196. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1503326
6. Gaunt, K. A., Spilman, S. K., Halub, M. E., Jackson, J. A., Lamb, K. D., & Sahr, S. M. (2020). High-flow nasal cannula in a mixed adult ICU. Respiratory Care, 65(10), 1547–1554. https://doi.org/10.4187/respcare.07523
7. Groves, N., & Tobin, A. (2007). High flow nasal oxygen generates positive airway pressure in adult volunteers. Australian Critical Care, 20(4), 126–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aucc.2007.08.001
8. Hernández, G., Vaquero, C., Colinas, L., Cuena, R., González, P., Canabal, A., Sanchez, S., Rodriguez, M. L., Villasclaras, A., & Fernández, R. (2016). Effect of postextubation high-flow nasal cannula vs noninvasive ventilation on reintubation and postextubation respiratory failure in high-risk patients: A randomized clinical trial. JAMA, 316(15), 1565–1574. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.14194
9. Kang, B. J., Koh, Y., Lim, C. M., Huh, J. W., Baek, S., Han, M., Seo, H. S., Suh, H. J., Seo, G. J., Kim, E. Y., & Hong, S. B. (2015). Failure of high-flow nasal cannula therapy may delay intubation and increase mortality. Intensive Care Medicine, 41(4), 623–632. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-015-3693-5
10. Lemiale, V., Mokart, D., Resche-Rigon, M., Pène, F., Mayaux, J., Faucher, E., Nyunga, M., Girault, C., Perez, P., Guitton, C., Ekpe, K., Kouatchet, A., Théodose, I., Benoit, D., Canet, E., Barbier, F., Rabbat, A., Bruneel, F., Vincent, F., ... Azoulay, E. (2015). Effect of noninvasive ventilation vs oxygen therapy on mortality among immunocompromised patients with acute respiratory failure: A randomized clinical trial. JAMA, 314(16), 1711–1719. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2015.12402
11. Mauri, T., Turrini, C., Eronia, N., Grasselli, G., Volta, C. A., Bellani, G., & Pesenti, A. (2017). Physiologic effects of high-flow nasal cannula in acute hypoxemic respiratory failure. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 195(9), 1207–1215. https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201605-0916OC
12. Möller, W., Feng, S., Domanski, U., Franke, K. J., Celik, G., Bartenstein, P., Becker, S., Meyer, G., Schmid, O., Eickelberg, O., Tatkov, S., & Nilius, G. (2017). Nasal high flow reduces dead space. Journal of Applied Physiology, 122(1), 191–197. https://doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.00584.2016
13. Nishimura, M. (2016). High-flow nasal cannula oxygen therapy in adults: Physiological benefits, indication, clinical benefits, and adverse effects. Respiratory Care, 61(4), 529–541. https://doi.org/10.4187/respcare.04577
14. Parke, R. L., McGuinness, S. P., & Eccleston, M. L. (2011). A preliminary randomized controlled trial to assess effectiveness of nasal high-flow oxygen in intensive care patients. Respiratory Care, 56(3), 265–270. https://doi.org/10.4187/respcare.00801
15. Ritchie, J. E., Williams, A. B., Gerard, C., & Hockey, H. (2011). Evaluation of a humidified nasal high-flow oxygen system, using oxygraphy, capnography and measurement of upper airway pressures. Anaesthesia and Intensive Care, 39(6), 1103–1110. https://doi.org/10.1177/0310057X1103900620
16. Roca, O., Messika, J., Caralt, B., García-de-Acilu, M., Sztrymf, B., Ricard, J. D., & Masclans, J. R. (2016). Predicting success of high-flow nasal cannula in pneumonia patients with hypoxemic respiratory failure: The utility of the ROX index. Journal of Critical Care, 35, 200–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2016.05.022
17. Rochwerg, B., Granton, D., Wang, D. X., Helviz, Y., Einav, S., Frat, J. P., Mekontso-Dessap, A., Schreiber, A., Azoulay, E., Mercat, A., Demoule, A., Lemiale, V., Pesenti, A., Riviello, E. D., Mauri, T., Mancebo, J., Brochard, L., & Burns, K. (2019). High flow nasal cannula compared with conventional oxygen therapy for acute hypoxemic respiratory failure: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Intensive Care Medicine, 45(5), 563–572. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-019-05590-5
18. Slutsky, A. S., & Ranieri, V. M. (2013). Ventilator-induced lung injury. New England Journal of Medicine, 369(22), 2126–2136. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1208707
19. Wettstein, R. B., Shelledy, D. C., & Peters, J. I. (2005). Delivered oxygen concentrations using low-flow and high-flow nasal cannulas. Respiratory Care, 50(5), 604–609.
20. Williams, R., Rankin, N., Smith, T., Galler, D., & Seakins, P. (1996). Relationship between the humidity and temperature of inspired gas and the function of the airway mucosa. Critical Care Medicine, 24(11), 1920–1929. https://doi.org/10.1097/00003246-199611000-00025