Oxygen Reserve Index: Validation of a New Variable
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BACKGROUND: Pulse oximetry–derived oxygen saturation is typically >97% in normoxia and hyperoxia, limiting its clinical use. The new Oxygen Reserve Index (ORi), a relative indicator of the partial pressure of oxygen dissolved in arterial blood (Pao2) in the range of 100–200 mm Hg, may allow additional monitoring of oxygen status.

METHODS: In this prospective validation intervention study, 20 healthy volunteers were breathing standardized oxygen concentrations ranging from mild hypoxia (fraction of inspired oxygen = 0.14) to hyperoxia (fraction of inspired oxygen = 1.0) via a tight-fitting face mask. ORi was measured noninvasively by multiwavelength pulse co-oximetry using 2 finger sensors. These ORi values (unitless scale, 0.00–1.00) were compared with measured Pao2 values. Repeated-measurements correlation analysis was performed to assess the ORi/Pao2 relationship. ORi trending ability was assessed using a 4-quadrant plot. The area under the receiver operating characteristics curve was calculated to assess the prediction of hypoxia (low-ranged Pao2, <100 mm Hg).

RESULTS: Within the ORi-sensitive range, a strong positive correlation was found between ORi and Pao2 for both sensors (R = 0.78 and 0.83; P < .0001). ORi trending of Pao2 was good within this range (concordance rate = 94%). The prediction of Pao2 <100 mm Hg was also good, with an area under the receiver operating characteristics curve of 0.91 and 99% sensitivity and 82% specificity.

CONCLUSIONS: In this prospective volunteer validation study, a strong and positive correlation between Pao2 and ORi was found, together with a good trending ability. Based on these data, the future use of ORi as a continuous noninvasive monitoring tool for assessing oxygenation status in patients receiving supplemental oxygen might be supported. (Anesth Analg XXX;XXX:00–00)

KEY POINTS

• Question: Does Oxygen Reserve Index (ORi) reflect oxygenation during moderate hyperoxia?
• Findings: ORi and partial pressure of oxygen dissolved in arterial blood (Pao2) were strongly correlated in healthy volunteers, with good trending ability.
• Meaning: The trend in ORi can be used to track changes in Pao2.

There is no doubt that monitoring a patient’s oxygen status during anesthesia using pulse oximetry is essential and is considered standard care in the perioperative setting.1,2 Nevertheless, monitoring oxygenation using pulse oximetry has its limitations, because during normoxia and hyperoxia, oxygen saturation (Spo2) is >97% in the typical patient, especially in those patients receiving supplemental oxygen. Meanwhile, actual partial pressure of oxygen dissolved in arterial blood (Pao2) can vary substantially ranging from normoxia (80–100 mm Hg) to extreme hyperoxia (~500–600 mm Hg). Hence, Spo2 monitoring gives little information on Pao2 under such circumstances, necessitating arterial blood gas analysis (BGA), which is both invasive and gives intermittent information on oxygenation only. In addition, it is associated with additional costs and time delay, blood loss when performed repeatedly, and occurrence of puncture-related complications.3

Recently, the Oxygen Reserve Index (ORi), a new relative indicator of Pao2, has been introduced. It is derived from noninvasive multiwavelength pulse co-oximetry (Rainbow SET; Masimo, Irvine, CA). ORi is based on technology as published before4–6 and uses wavelengths of light to collect optical absorbance information in the moderate hyperoxic range and resolves extremely small differences in absorbance into a unitless index (range, 0.00–1.00). The ORi algorithm is optimized for detecting changes in Pao2 during mild-to-moderate hyperoxia, that is, in the range of 100–200 mm Hg (“ORi-sensitive range”). Previously,7 a positive correlation between intraoperative values of ORi and Pao2 was found over a wide range (62–534 mm Hg) of Pao2 values. In another study, ORi monitoring provided an advance warning of an impending hypoxic state, with a median (range) detection of impeding desaturation of 31.5 seconds (19–34 seconds) before changes in Spo2 actually occurred.4

There are no data systematically comparing Pao2 with ORi within its sensitive range as of yet. Therefore, this
prospective interventional validation study in healthy volunteers was set up to validate ORi by comparing it with whole blood references of arterial blood. By exposing subjects to standardized oxygen concentrations via a tight-fitting face mask, the hypothesis was tested that ORi reflects PaO2 within the ORi-sensitive range. Additionally, the validity of ORi for PaO2 values outside its designated, sensitive range was regarded equally important. Therefore, subjects were additionally exposed to oxygen concentrations beyond the ORi-sensitive range, aimed to induce mild hypoxia (fraction of inspired oxygen [Fio2] = 0.14) and extreme hyperoxia (Fio2 = 1.0).

METHODS
This study was approved by the ethics committee of Brabant, the Netherlands (Ref: NL52290.028.15; date of registration: May 27, 2015), and written informed consent was obtained from all subjects participating in the trial. The trial was registered before subject enrollment at ClinicalTrials.gov (Ref: NCT02561052; principal investigator: T.W.L.S.; date of registration: September 25, 2015). This manuscript adheres to the applicable Transparent Reporting of Evaluations with Non-randomized Designs (TREND) guidelines. Twenty healthy volunteers (age, 24 ± 6 years; body mass index, 24 ± 3 kg·m⁻²) were included in this prospective validation interventional study after individual health assessment.

Study Protocol
Skin pigmentation of the volunteers was determined by the Massey scale.⁸ On arrival in the research unit, the volunteer was connected to a standard anesthesia monitor (Philips IntelliVue MP70; Philips, Eindhoven, the Netherlands) for monitoring of electrocardiography, noninvasive cuff manometry, and pulse oximetry. ORi and Spo2 were measured noninvasively by multilambda pulse co-oximetry with the Radical-7 monitor (Masimo Corp). Two separate ORi sensors (lot No. 14N3Z) were placed on the volunteer’s second and fourth fingers of the left hand and covered with a light shielding bag to prevent any optical interference. A peripheral intravenous line was inserted in a large left forearm vein, and the left radial artery was cannulated using aseptic technique and 0.5%-1% lidocaine for local anesthesia. Paired arterial and venous blood samples were drawn at baseline and at the end of each oxygen concentration (see below) in heparinized 1-mL syringes for immediate BGA. After taking the baseline samples, a tight-fitting face mask was placed and fixed with rubber bands around the head. Gas mixture was tightly controlled using a semiopen spontaneous breathing system. Fio2 was monitored using the Philips G7 (Philips, Eindhoven, the Netherlands) gas analyzer module, which was calibrated on a daily basis. Fio2 was increased in steps of 0.03 until an Fio2 of 0.36 was reached, aimed at achieving a PaO2 value between 100 and 200 mm Hg, considered to be the ORi-sensitive range. Each Fio2 step was maintained for at least 2 minutes before blood samples were drawn. After reaching the Fio2 level of 0.36, Fio2 was increased to 1.0, and after waiting for at least 2 minutes, 3 paired blood samples were taken 2 minutes apart. Thereafter, Fio2 was reduced again to 0.36 and then reduced further in steps of 0.03 until room air level (0.21) with intervals of at least 2 minutes. Subsequently, hypoxia was induced by adding an air/nitrogen mixture (Fio2 = 0.14) to the breathing circuit to achieve an Spo2 level of slightly below 90%. Once the desired Spo2 had been reached and stabilized, 3 paired blood samples were taken 2 minutes apart before Fio2 was changed back to room air. To increase data robustness and repeatability, the stepwise increase in Fio2 as described above (in steps of 0.03 until 0.36 and then to 1.0) was performed twice, followed by a direct return to room air level.

Blood Gas Analysis
PaO2 was determined using satellite lab BGA (Siemens Rapidpoint 405 Co-oximeter; Siemens, Munich, Germany), which was located at the research ward. This device performs an autocalibration every 6 hours. All paired arterial and venous blood samples were drawn from the radial artery catheter and peripheral venous line, respectively, and were collected into standard 1-mL heparinized syringes. To ensure valid BGA, immediately after the sample was drawn, the syringe was deaerated, carefully mixed, and promptly analyzed.

Data Registration and Analysis
The electronic data of the standard anesthesia monitor and Radical-7 monitor were stored and imported into Microsoft Excel 2010 (Microsoft, Redmond, WA) for synchronization and graphical representation. A visual inspection of the data plots was performed for detection of artifact-induced outliers or missing data.

Statistical Analysis
Statistical analysis was performed in SPSS version 22 (IBM Inc, Chicago, IL). Normality of continuous variables was assessed by the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. Continuous data are expressed as mean (standard deviation) for parametric data or as median (first quartile–third quartile) for nonparametric data. Correlation analysis between PaO2 and ORi was restricted to the ORi-sensitive range (ie, PaO2 >100–200 mm Hg), given that the ORi algorithm was defined for use within this range. To account for the nonindependent and repeated character of this study, a repeated-measures correlation (rmcorr) analysis was performed using the rmcorr R-package (R statistics, R Core Team, Vienna, Austria). The rmcorr model, which behaves like a generalized linear model, investigates the strength of the relationship between 2 continuous variables (ie, PaO2 and ORi), while accounting for between-participant variation. Here, a common slope is generated to fit the typical PaO2–ORi relationship in the typical subject. Subsequently, parallel regression slopes with varying offsets of individual subjects are fitted to the model. For the interested reader, a detailed description of the rmcorr model is given elsewhere.⁹ Of note, the parallel slope represents the strength of the relationship, while the varying intercepts of individual curve fits represent the model-predicted ORi value at a PaO2 of 100 mm Hg. The rmcorr coefficient (Rm) was calculated additionally (range: ~1 to 1, as in Pearson R correlation analysis), together with its 95% confidence interval (95% CI). In addition, the correlation between ORi and partial pressure of oxygen dissolved in venous blood (Pvo2) was assessed for data points obtained within the ORi-sensitive range. To visualize ORi trending ability within the ORi-sensitive range, linear regression slopes with varying offsets of individual subjects were plotted for detection of artifact-induced outliers or missing data.
range, a 4-quadrant plot was made, where change in arterial partial pressure of oxygen (ΔPao2) between consecutive data points was plotted against ΔORi between these data points, after removal of null changes in ΔPao2 or ΔORi. The concordance was calculated as the number of data points with an identical trend (upper right + lower left corner versus the total number of data points), and an exclusion zone was defined as ΔORi <0.1 and/or ΔPao2 <10 mm Hg. To additionally assess trending ability within the ORi-sensitive range, series of Pao2 threshold levels were chosen from 110 to 190 mm Hg in steps of 10 mm Hg for the calculation of sensitivity, specificity, and concordance using a cross-table. ΔPao2 and ΔORi were computed by taking the difference of all ORi and Pao2 readings from the study with the chosen Pao2 threshold level; here, the data pair with a Pao2 value closest to the threshold value within a ±10-mm Hg search window was selected as reference. Finally, to assess the adequacy of ORi in predicting the transition from hyperoxia to normoxia/hypoxia (ie, Pao2 <100 mm Hg), receiver operating characteristics (ROC) analysis was performed, and the area under the ROC curve was calculated, together with the associated sensitivity and specificity. All tests were performed 2 tailed, and statistical significance was defined as P < .05 in all cases. At the time of study design, no ORi data were available for calculating a sample size. The inclusion of 20 subjects in a repeated-measures design was deemed sufficient for assessing the ORi–Pao2 relationship.

RESULTS

After receiving written informed consent, a total of 21 volunteers were recruited for participation in the study. Characteristics of these subjects are given in Table 1. One additional volunteer was recruited after arterial catheterization failed in 1 volunteer. As such, 20 volunteers were included in the final analysis. At baseline, while breathing room air, mean (standard deviation) Pao2 and Spo2 were 101 mm Hg (4 mm Hg) and 99% (1%), respectively. The associated mean ORi value was 0.02 (0.05). In Figure 1, the evolution of all individual values of ORi (n = 40, 2 sensors per volunteer), Pao2, and Pvo2 is shown, synchronized from the start of the study. Additionally shown are the median and interquartile range of the observed ORi values.

While Fio2 ranged from 0.14 (mild hypoxia) to 1.00 (hyperoxia), observed Pao2 values ranged from 43 to 655 mm Hg, respectively, while concomitant Pvo2 values ranged from 32 to 465 mm Hg. In total, 545 data points from simultaneous ORi values and Pao2 from arterial blood samples were obtained per sensor, yielding a total of 1090 paired data points. Of these paired data points, 202 data points were collected for Pao2 values <100 mm Hg, 630 data points for Pao2 100–200 mm Hg, and 258 data points for Pao2 >200 mm Hg. All data points from both ORi sensors are shown in Figure 2. Data points from both sensors obtained during mild hypoxia, normoxia, and moderate hyperoxia are given in blue circles (n = 868), while paired data points obtained during extreme hyperoxia are shown in green circles (n = 222).

The ORi-Sensitive Range

A total of 630 paired data points were obtained within the ORi-sensitive range. Here, mean ORi from both sensors was 0.16 (0.15) with an observed minimal and maximal value of 0.00 and 1.00, respectively. Associated values of Spo2 were ≥97% for all data points. In Figure 3A, B, the results of linear curve fitting using the rmcorr analysis are shown for both ORi finger sensors apart, while Figure 3C shows the results for the mean ORi value of both sensors. For all instances, correlation was positive (P < .0001), with R2 values of 0.78, 0.83, and 0.84 for sensor 1, sensor 2, and the mean of both sensors, respectively. There was no significant correlation between Pvo2 and ORi within the ORi-sensitive range (defined based on Pao2 values).

Association of Pao2 With ORi Outside the Sensitive Range

In case Pao2 was <100 mm Hg, ORi (n = 202 for paired data points from both sensors) was 0.00 in 99% of the data points, while Spo2 was 93% (5%) for these data points. In addition, if ORi was 0.00 (n = 374, paired data points from both sensors), Pao2 was <100 mm Hg in 56% of data points, while the highest observed Pao2 at which ORi was 0.00 was 171 mm Hg. The area under the ROC curve for ORi predicting a Pao2 <100 mm Hg was 0.91 (95% CI, 0.89–0.92), with an optimal cutoff value of 0.01 and an associated sensitivity and specificity of 99% and 82%, respectively (95% CI, 98%–100%; 77%–87%, respectively). In case Pao2 was >200 mm Hg, there was a wide distribution of ORi values (n = 258 for paired data points from both sensors; Figure 2, green circles).

ORi Trending Ability

For assessing the trending ability of ORi values within the ORi-sensitive range, a 4-quadrant plot was used (Figure 4). After applying an exclusion zone of 10 mm Hg and 0.1 for ΔPao2 and ΔORi values, respectively, the concordance rate (95% CI) for the investigated data points (n = 474 for paired data points from both sensors) was 94% (92%–96%). Without an exclusion zone, the concordance rate was 93% (91%–95%) for all 507 paired data points. In Table 2, the sensitivity, specificity, and concordance rate were shown for all data points. In Figure 3A, B, the results of linear curve fitting using the rmcorr analysis are shown for both ORi finger sensors apart, while Figure 3C shows the results for the mean ORi value of both sensors. For all instances, correlation was positive (P < .0001), with R2 values of 0.78, 0.83, and 0.84 for sensor 1, sensor 2, and the mean of both sensors, respectively. There was no significant correlation between Pvo2 and ORi within the ORi-sensitive range (defined based on Pao2 values).

DISCUSSION

This study is the first prospective validation study in human volunteers systematically investigating the relationship between ORi and oxygen status at multiple standardized inspiratory oxygen concentrations. Within the ORi-sensitive

Table 1. Subject Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (male/female)</th>
<th>5/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASA physical status</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (y)</td>
<td>24 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>72 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>174 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg·m−2)</td>
<td>24 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massey scale</td>
<td>1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given are the mean (SD) or absolute numbers. Abbreviations: ASA, American Society of Anesthesiologists; BMI, body mass index; SD, standard deviation.
range (Pao2, 100–200 mm Hg), we found a strong positive correlation between Pao2 and ORi, with a good ORi trending ability with respect to Pao2 changes “within” this range. Hence, ORi monitoring might be considered a potential non-invasive tool for assessing oxygenation in patients receiving supplemental oxygen. Additionally, sensitivity and specificity of ORi for detecting low-ranged Pao2 values (<100 mm Hg)—outside its designated sensitivity range—was good, suggesting that ORi monitoring potentially allows for predicting impending hypoxia at a stage when Spo2 values are still at maximum (297%). We observed a strong positive correlation between Pao2 and ORi within the ORi-sensitive range, being slightly higher compared to the correlation found in the only available study up to now.7 In this retrospective study in surgical patients (n = 106), an r2 value of 0.536 (R = 0.73) was found for the linear Pao2–ORi correlation for Pao2 values between 62 and 240 mm Hg. Our study was set up to obtain a substantial number of ORi values for Pao2 between 100 and 200 mm Hg, considering this the ORi-sensitive range. Hence, we restricted our correlation analyses to the values obtained within this range. These data suggest that ORi provides a reasonable estimation of Pao2 under moderate hyperoxia. Importantly, we observed that, within volunteers, substantial differences can exist between the absolute values of simultaneously measured ORi values from sensors placed at different sites on the subject. However, no substantial difference between Pao2 correlation with ORi from either of the 2 sensors or its mean value was observed (Figure 3A–C). Supplemental Digital Content, Figure 1, http://links.lww.com/AA/C533, in which the individual trend in Fio2 and 2 ORi values is given for 1 volunteer, serves as an example. The underlying cause of the difference needs further investigational studies and is beyond the scope of this article. Clinically, this may limit one to rely on absolute ORi values as a direct measure of oxygen reserve, especially in case an accurate oxygenation assessment is necessary, for example, during (advanced) airway management (eg, apneic oxygenation11), or in the intensive care unit in pulmonary compromised patients. In this context, the observed variation in absolute ORi values within a subject could be troublesome in patients at risk for the harm(s) of either hypoxia or hyperoxia because the therapeutic target range for oxygen administration is small for an adequate “titration” of oxygen if the clinician is to rely on the absolute ORi value. Also, the apparent differences in absolute ORi values might be amplified in those patients with (cardiopulmonary) comorbidity. Still, given the similar trending behavior from both ORi sensors, the observed differences are not expected to hinder clinical decision-making if one relies on relative changes in ORi. Given the current observations, an ORi of, for example, 0.00 should not be expected to represent a Pao2 of 100, and neither should an ORi value of 1.00 be expected to represent Pao2 to be 200 mm Hg. Instead, using relative changes in ORi might be more appropriate, as supported by the high concordance rate observed in our study. The manufacturer additionally states that, in its current form,
ORi is designed as a “trend” variable, not as an equivalent measure of \( \text{Pao}_2 \). In a previous pilot study in preoxygenated pediatric patients just after tracheal intubation, the ventilator circuit was disconnected and \( \text{Pao}_2 \) was allowed to drop, after which the ORi monitor alarmed well before an \( \text{Spo}_2 \) dropped from 100% to 98%. Another recent study confirmed these findings during rapid sequence induction in adult patients. In this context, our observation that the changes in \( \text{Pao}_2 \)—within the ORi-sensitive range—are well reflected by changes in the ORi variable, as well as the observed adequate prediction of transition to a low-ranged \( \text{Pao}_2 \), emphasizes the potential use of relative ORi values.

Clinically, the evolution of ORi for \( \text{Pao}_2 \) values outside the ORi-sensitive range may even be more important: similar to fluid therapy, there is a U-shaped relation between oxygenation and harm, with both hypoxia and hyperoxia being detrimental. As such, adequately assessing and titrating oxygenation is important for avoiding both instances. At 1.0 \( \text{Fio}_2 \), however (\( \text{Pao}_2, 500–700 \text{ mm Hg} \)), there was no linear correlation (Figure 2) between \( \text{Pao}_2 \) and ORi, with \( \text{Spo}_2 \) being 100% for all data points. This observation confirms a previous report in which absence of \( \text{Pao}_2/\text{ORi} \) correlation was found for slightly lower \( \text{Pao}_2 \) values in the range of 300–500 mm Hg. Still, one must realize that associated ORi values in this \( \text{Pao}_2 \) range show substantial variation (from 0.30 to 1.00; Figure 2), limiting the use of ORi in the (extreme) hyperoxic range. On the other hand, for the lower normoxic and hypoxic range, we could show that the prediction of a low \( \text{Pao}_2 \) using ORi was good, with a very high sensitivity (99%) and high specificity (82%).

**Figure 3.** Relation between \( \text{Pao}_2 \) and ORi values. A–C, Scatterplot of \( \text{Pao}_2 \) and ORi values per sensor per subject, after linear curve fitting using the repeated measures correlation analysis for sensor 1 (A), sensor 2 (B), and the mean of both these sensors (C). Each color represents an individual volunteer. Given is the repeated measures correlation coefficient \( (R_m) \), as well as the equation for the common regression line. CI indicates confidence interval; ORi, Oxygen Reserve Index; \( \text{Pao}_2 \), partial pressure of oxygen dissolved in arterial blood.
observations indicate that, based on this sensitivity, ORi correctly classifies PaO\textsubscript{2} values <100 mm Hg in almost all cases with a low false-negative rate (i.e., PaO\textsubscript{2} <100 mm Hg, while ORi indicates the opposite). The observed 82% specificity indicates the substantial chance of correctly classifying PaO\textsubscript{2} to be >100 mm Hg. Hence, ORi might function as an indicator of (impending) hypoxia or, otherwise stated, could provide reassurance that PaO\textsubscript{2} >100 mm Hg is likely. Meanwhile, it must be kept in mind that, for ORi values at 0.00, only 56% of PaO\textsubscript{2} data points were actually <100 mm Hg. So, for clinical purposes, in 44% of the cases, a false alarm would have been raised if ORi was used to indicate the presence of hypoxia. However, for the latter purpose, pulse oximetry could be used instead. Of note, Spo2 was >97% in all cases with PaO\textsubscript{2} >100 mm Hg (data not shown), confirming that Spo2 is of little use in case that hypoxia has not ensued “yet.”

### Study Limitations

At first, FiO\textsubscript{2} was altered stepwise in steps from 0.21 to 0.36, after which an FiO\textsubscript{2} of 1.0 was applied. We therefore cannot assess the ORi–PaO\textsubscript{2} relationship in the 0.36–1.0 FiO\textsubscript{2} range. At second, while we could not find a relationship between Pvo2 and ORi, it is important to consider that Pvo2 was measured from BGA drawn from a peripheral venous catheter. Therefore, measured Pvo2 might include bias in case of regional perfusion differences. Finally, we investigated healthy volunteers in an optimized, experimental setting. Additional studies are required to confirm these findings in a clinical setting. Also, the influence of patient comorbidity (e.g., severe anemia and cardiopulmonary disease) and clinical circumstances (e.g., the type of fluids infused,\textsuperscript{18} hemodynamic instability, and use of vasoactive agents) on absolute and relative ORi values during different states of oxygenation requires further research.

### Table 2. ORI Trending Ability With Different PaO\textsubscript{2} Values Set as Reference Threshold\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PaO\textsubscript{2} Reference Threshold (mm Hg)</th>
<th>Sensitivity (%)</th>
<th>Specificity (%)</th>
<th>Concordance (%)</th>
<th>Data Points (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>99 (99–100)</td>
<td>82 (78–85)</td>
<td>87 (85–89)</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>99 (97–100)</td>
<td>88 (84–91)</td>
<td>93 (91–94)</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>98 (95–99)</td>
<td>92 (89–95)</td>
<td>95 (93–97)</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>96 (94–98)</td>
<td>92 (88–95)</td>
<td>95 (93–97)</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>97 (96–98)</td>
<td>88 (83–92)</td>
<td>95 (93–96)</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>96 (94–98)</td>
<td>87 (81–92)</td>
<td>94 (92–96)</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>96 (94–97)</td>
<td>86 (78–92)</td>
<td>94 (92–96)</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>96 (94–97)</td>
<td>73 (59–84)</td>
<td>94 (92–96)</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>94 (92–96)</td>
<td>58 (37–77)</td>
<td>93 (91–95)</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: ΔORi indicates change in ORi value; PaO\textsubscript{2}, partial pressure of oxygen dissolved in arterial blood; ΔPaO\textsubscript{2}, change in arterial partial pressure of oxygen; ORi, Oxygen Reserve Index.

\textsuperscript{a}Additional trending analysis: PaO\textsubscript{2} threshold levels are chosen from 110 to 190 mm Hg in steps of 10 mm Hg to cover the range of 100–200 mm Hg. These values serve as reference for each row of the calculation in the table. ΔPaO\textsubscript{2} and ΔORi are computed by taking difference of all ORi and PaO\textsubscript{2} readings from the study with the chosen PaO\textsubscript{2} threshold. For example, for row 1, the PaO\textsubscript{2} data point closest to 110 mm Hg was identified (with a search window of 110 ± 10 mm Hg); this value, as well as its corresponding ORi value, is noted and served as reference. ΔPao2 is computed by taking difference of all other PaO\textsubscript{2} points from the subject with the reference PaO\textsubscript{2}. Similarly, ΔORi is computed by taking difference from corresponding ORi values to the determined reference ORi. These calculations were repeated per sensor per subject. Subsequently, sensitivity, specificity, and concordance values were tabulated in the first row, along with their respective confidence intervals. This procedure was repeated for all other rows for their respective PaO\textsubscript{2} threshold values. Data points with ΔPaO\textsubscript{2} <10 mm Hg and ΔORi <0.1 were discarded from the analysis. Data were gathered from all investigated subjects (n = 20).
In conclusion, in healthy volunteers, ORi provides reasonable trending information of PaO₂ around the moderate hyperoxic range of PaO₂ for which its use is intended. Also, changes in PaO₂ are well reflected by changes in ORi, with good concordance. The trend in ORi can be used to track changes in PaO₂ levels in the moderate hyperoxic region, and absolute values should not be interpreted for PaO₂ levels.
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