

EARLY MOBILITY AND PNEUMATIC VENTILATION

**Enabling Early Mobility in Mechanically Ventilated Patients:
Clinical Outcomes, Operational Barriers, and the Role of
Pneumatic Ventilation Systems**



Abstract

Early mobilization of mechanically ventilated patients is strongly supported by current critical care literature demonstrating improvements in functional recovery, ventilator-free days, and long-term outcomes. Despite this evidence, implementation barriers remain, particularly those related to equipment logistics during ambulation. Traditional ICU ventilators are heavy, battery-dependent systems that introduce operational complexity during patient mobility. Airon's pneumatic ventilators and CPAP systems provide a lightweight, battery-free alternative that may facilitate earlier ambulation while reducing maintenance burden and capital risk. This paper reviews peer-reviewed literature from the past five years regarding early mobilization in mechanically ventilated patients, examines operational challenges associated with conventional ventilators, and evaluates the potential role of pneumatic ventilation systems in supporting ICU mobility programs and reducing ventilator length of stay.

Introduction

Mechanical ventilation is a life-saving intervention but is associated with significant complications when prolonged, including ICU-acquired weakness, delirium, and long-term functional impairment (Paul, et al., 2025). Over the past decade, early mobility has become a cornerstone of ICU liberation strategies. Recent evidence continues to reinforce that early mobilization during mechanical ventilation improves patient-centered outcomes and may influence ventilator duration (Singam, 2024).

The purpose of this paper is to examine evidence supporting early mobility in mechanically ventilated patients and to discuss how equipment design, specifically pneumatic transport ventilation, may reduce logistical barriers that limit implementation.



Image sourced from Kali Dayton via LinkedIn

Evidence Supporting Early Mobility in Mechanically Ventilated Patients

A large multicenter randomized controlled trial by Hodgson, et al. (2022) evaluated early active mobilization during mechanical ventilation in ICU patients and demonstrated that structured mobility interventions were safe, feasible, and did not increase adverse events, while supporting improved functional recovery trajectories. These findings are reinforced by systematic review data showing that active mobilization improves functional outcomes at discharge and reduces physical impairment (Tipping et al., 2020), as well as randomized evidence that progressive mobility programs can reduce duration of mechanical ventilation while improving respiratory muscle strength (Schujmann et al., 2020). ICU practice guidelines continue to reinforce immobility prevention as a central component of ICU liberation strategies (Devlin et al., 2021).

Operational Barriers to Mobility

Despite robust evidence, operational challenges frequently impede implementation. Traditional ICU ventilators are electronically controlled, battery-dependent systems mounted on large carts. These devices require continuous power management, introduce risk of equipment damage during ambulation, and add physical burden to mobility teams. During transport or hallway ambulation, battery failure or power limitations may introduce safety concerns. In addition, the physical size and weight of conventional ICU ventilators can make ambulation cumbersome and resource intensive. This results in the clinician paying more attention to the ventilator than to the patient they are mobilizing. These logistical constraints may unintentionally delay mobilization, even when patients are clinically appropriate for ambulation.



Image sourced from Kali Dayton via LinkedIn

Pneumatic Ventilation Systems as a Mobility-Enabling Alternative

Pneumatic ventilators operate solely on pressurized gas and contain no electrical components or batteries, eliminating power dependency and reducing overall device weight. Compared with conventional ICU ventilators, these systems are lighter, more compact, and easily mounted to walkers or transport equipment, simplifying ambulation logistics. They have long been used for intrahospital transport because of their portability, ease of use, and are MRI conditional.

The absence of electronic boards and battery assemblies reduces maintenance requirements and may lower lifecycle costs. In mobility-driven ICU environments, decreased device complexity can enhance staff confidence and facilitate more consistent ambulation practices. Although pneumatic ventilators are not substitutes for full-featured ICU ventilators in complex cases, their use as dedicated mobility or transport ventilators may help close the gap between evidence supporting early mobilization and its practical implementation.



Image courtesy of WY'EAST - WHITNEY®

Clinical and Economic Implications

Reducing ventilator use by even a fraction of a day per patient may have a meaningful economic impact. Ventilator-free days correlate with ICU cost reduction and resource optimization, as ICU daily costs in the United States have been estimated at roughly \$2,900 per ICU day in a large U.S. hospital database analysis of ICU admissions (Ohsfeldt, et al., 2021).

By lowering equipment complexity, reducing capital risk during ambulation, and costs of traditional ventilator circuits pneumatic systems may serve as enablers of consistent mobility programs. Equipment alignment with mobility goals should therefore be considered a strategic decision within ICU quality improvement initiatives.

Discussion

The past five years of literature indicate that early mobilization in mechanically ventilated patients is safe, feasible, and associated with improved functional outcomes and increased ventilator-free days. The primary barrier to implementation is often operational rather than clinical.

Ventilator design influences the practicality of ambulation. Heavy, battery-dependent electronic ventilators introduce logistical concerns that may reduce mobilization frequency. Pneumatic ventilators, by contrast, offer simplicity, portability, and independence from electrical supply.

Further prospective research may clarify whether integration of dedicated mobility ventilators directly reduces ventilator length of stay. However, existing literature strongly supports the removal of barriers that impede early mobilization.

Conclusion

Contemporary evidence demonstrates that early mobility improves outcomes in mechanically ventilated patients and may increase ventilator-free days. Operational constraints, particularly those related to equipment complexity, remain a significant barrier. Pneumatic ventilation systems provide a lightweight, battery-free alternative that may facilitate safe and efficient ambulation. Aligning ventilator design with mobility protocols represents a practical strategy to bridge the gap between evidence and implementation.

References

Devlin, J. W., Skrobik, Y., Gélinas, C., Needham, D. M., Slooter, A. J. C., Pandharipande, P. P., et al. (2021). Executive summary: Clinical practice guidelines for the prevention and management of pain, agitation/sedation, delirium, immobility, and sleep disruption in adult ICU patients. *Critical Care Medicine*, 49(9), 1535–1548. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000005059>

Ohsfeldt, R. L., Choong, C. K., McCollam, P. L., Abouzaid, S., & Mody, S. H. (2021). Inpatient hospital costs for COVID-19 patients in the United States. *Advances in Therapy*, 38(11), 5557–5595. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12325-021-01887-4>

Paul, N., Buse, E. R., Grunow, J.J., Schaller, S.J. (2025). Prolonged mechanical ventilation in critically ill patients. *CHEST*, 168 (1), 106 – 118.

Schujmann, D. S., Teixeira Gomes, T., Lunardi, A. C., Zoccoler Lamano, M., Fragoso, A., Pimentel, M., Peso, C. N., Araujo, P., & Fu, C. (2020). Impact of a progressive mobility program on the functional status, respiratory, and muscular systems of ICU patients: A randomized and controlled trial. *Critical Care Medicine*, 48(4), 491–497. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000004181>

Singam, A. (2024). Mobilizing progress: A comprehensive review of the efficacy of early mobilization therapy in the intensive care unit. *Cureus*, 16(4), e57595. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.57595>

Tipping, C. J., Harrold, M., Holland, A., Romero, L., Nisbet, T., & Hodgson, C. L. (2020). The effects of active mobilization and rehabilitation in ICU on mortality and function: A systematic review. *Intensive Care Medicine*, 46(3), 553–567. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-019-05849-9>



Part of the Inspiration Healthcare Group

Airon Corporation
751 North Drive, Unit 6 Melbourne
Florida 32934 USA
Telephone +1-321-821-9433
Fax +1-321-821-9443
www.airon.inspirationhealthcaregroup.com