

Intervention Protocol: The incentive spirometry (IS) protocol for the intervention group included the following:

- Patients were provided with a standardized IS device.
- A respiratory therapist trained patients on the proper usage of the device.
- Patients performed IS three times daily for 10 to 20 minutes per session, aiming to reach a target volume, followed by a breath hold for 3 to 5 seconds.
- Postoperatively, IS was resumed as soon as patients were stable and alert.

Compliance with the IS protocol was monitored through a daily log maintained by the patients, which was reviewed by the clinical staff. For both groups, postoperative IS was initiated on day 1 after surgery, with the target of performing IS three times daily for 10-20 minutes per session.

Outcomes: The study focused on the following primary and secondary outcomes:

- **Primary outcome:** The incidence of PPCs, including atelectasis, pneumonia, and pleural effusion, within 30 days postoperatively. PPCs were diagnosed based on standardized clinical and radiographic criteria:
 - **Atelectasis:** Diagnosed by chest X-ray showing partial or complete lung collapse.
 - **Pneumonia:** Diagnosed by new or progressive infiltrates on chest X-ray, combined with fever, leukocytosis, and positive sputum culture.
 - **Pleural Effusion:** Diagnosed by chest X-ray or ultrasonography showing fluid accumulation.
- **Secondary outcomes:**
 - **Postoperative oxygenation levels,** measured using arterial blood gas (ABG) analysis for PaO₂ and continuous SpO₂ monitoring. PaO₂ was measured within the first 24 hours postoperatively, while SpO₂ was monitored continuously for the first 72 hours.
 - **Length of hospital stay** (in days).
 - **Postoperative pain,** assessed using the Visual Analog Scale (VAS) at 24, 48, and 72 hours.
 - **Early mobilization,** defined as the time to first ambulation (in hours) and frequency of ambulation within the first 72 hours postoperatively.

Statistical analysis: Data were analyzed using SPSS version 26. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize patient demographics and baseline characteristics. Categorical variables such as the incidence of PPCs were compared between groups using the chi-square test, while continuous variables (e.g., PaO₂, length of hospital stay, VAS scores)

were analyzed using independent t-tests or Mann-Whitney U tests, as appropriate. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Patient demographics and baseline characteristics: A total of 100 patients were randomized into the study, with 50 patients in the Intervention Group (preoperative IS) and 50 in the Control Group (postoperative IS only). The mean age was 46.2 ± 11.8 years, and there were no significant differences between the groups in terms of age, gender, body mass index (BMI), or smoking history. Both groups had a comparable distribution of comorbidities, including diabetes and hypertension (p > 0.05 for all comparisons) (Table 1) (Figure 1).

Table 1: Patient demographics and baseline characteristics

Variable	Intervention Group (n = 50)	Control Group (n = 50)	p-value
Age (years, mean ± SD)	46.0 ± 12.0	46.4 ± 11.6	0.85
Male (%)	56%	58%	0.78
Diabetes (%)	22%	24%	0.8
Hypertension (%)	30%	28%	0.72
Smoking (%)	34%	36%	0.76




Figure 1: Comparison of patient demographics and baseline characteristics between the Intervention Group (preoperative IS) and Control Group (postoperative IS only). No significant differences were observed between the two groups, indicating successful randomization.

Incidence of Postoperative Pulmonary Complications (PPCs): The primary outcome, the incidence of PPCs, was significantly lower in the Intervention Group compared to the Control Group. PPCs occurred in 5 patients (10%) in the Intervention Group and 13 patients (26%) in the Control Group (p = 0.01) (Table 2) (Figure 2).

Postoperative Oxygenation: Postoperative oxygenation, as measured by PaO₂ and SpO₂, was significantly better

in the Intervention Group. The mean increase in PaO₂ was 18% in the Intervention Group compared to 10% in the Control Group (p = 0.02). SpO₂ levels were also higher in the Intervention Group, although the difference was not statistically significant (Table 3) (Figure 3).

Table 2: Incidence of postoperative pulmonary complications

Complication	Intervention Group (n = 50)	Control Group (n = 50)	p-value
Atelectasis	2 (4%)	5 (10%)	0.24
Pneumonia	2 (4%)	4 (8%)	0.4
Pleural Effusion	1 (2%)	4 (8%)	0.18
Total PPCs	5 (10%)	13 (26%)	0.01




Figure 2: Incidence of postoperative pulmonary complications (PPCs) in the Intervention Group (preoperative IS) versus the Control Group (postoperative IS only). The Intervention Group had a significantly lower incidence of PPCs (10% vs. 26%, p = 0.01).

Table 3: Postoperative Oxygenation (PaO₂ Levels).

Time Point	Intervention Group (Mean ± SD)	Control Group (Mean ± SD)	p-value
Preoperative (baseline)	81.0 ± 10.2 mmHg	80.6 ± 10.8 mmHg	0.8
Postoperative (24 hours)	95.6 ± 11.5 mmHg	88.6 ± 12.0 mmHg	0.03
% Change in PaO ₂	18%	10%	0.02

Length of hospital stay: The median length of hospital stay was significantly shorter in the Intervention Group compared to the Control Group. Patients in the Intervention Group had a median hospital stay of 6 days (IQR: 5-7 days), while those in the Control Group had a median stay of 9 days (IQR: 8-10 days) (p = 0.01) (Table 4).

Pain Scores: Postoperative pain, as assessed by the visual analog scale (VAS), was lower in the Intervention Group compared to the Control Group at all measured time points. The mean VAS score at 48 hours postoperatively was 3.0 in

the Intervention Group compared to 4.2 in the Control Group (p = 0.02) (Table 5) (Figure 4).

Early Mobilization: Patients in the Intervention Group achieved early mobilization significantly faster than those in the Control Group. The mean time to first ambulation was 28 hours in the Intervention Group compared to 36 hours in the Control Group (p = 0.03).




Figure 3: Changes in postoperative PaO₂ levels in the Intervention Group (preoperative IS) versus the Control Group (postoperative IS only). The Intervention Group showed a greater increase in PaO₂ levels postoperatively (18% vs. 10%, p = 0.02).

Table 4: Length of hospital stay.

Group	Median (IQR)	p-value
Intervention Group	6 days (5-7 days)	
Control Group	9 days (8-10 days)	0.01

Table 5: Postoperative Pain Scores (VAS).

Time Point	Intervention Group (Mean ± SD)	Control Group (Mean ± SD)	p-value
24 hours post-op	3.4 ± 1.0	4.5 ± 1.2	0.04
48 hours post-op	3.0 ± 0.9	4.2 ± 1.1	0.02
72 hours post-op	2.8 ± 0.8	4.0 ± 1.0	0.01




Figure 4: Postoperative pain scores measured by the visual analog scale (VAS) at 24, 48, and 72 hours postoperatively in the Intervention Group (preoperative IS) versus the Control Group (postoperative IS only). The Intervention Group reported significantly lower pain scores at each time point.

Discussion

This study demonstrates that preoperative incentive spirometry (IS), when added to standard postoperative IS, significantly reduces postoperative pulmonary complications (PPCs) in patients undergoing elective midline laparotomies lasting more than 2 hours. The results highlight that preoperative IS not only lowers the incidence of PPCs but also improves postoperative oxygenation, shortens hospital stay, reduces postoperative pain, and accelerates early mobilization.

Interpretation of results: The incidence of PPCs was significantly lower in the intervention group, with a PPC rate of 10% compared to 26% in the control group (Table 2) (Figure 2). This reduction in PPCs aligns with prior studies demonstrating the effectiveness of IS in preventing atelectasis, pneumonia, and pleural effusion [1,10]. The preoperative use of IS likely prepared the respiratory system by enhancing lung expansion and increasing diaphragmatic function before surgery, leading to better postoperative outcomes.

The use of preoperative IS was especially effective in improving postoperative oxygenation, as indicated by the greater increase in PaO₂ in the intervention group compared to the control group (Table 3) (Figure 3). Improved PaO₂ levels suggest better alveolar ventilation and gas exchange, which are critical for reducing PPCs and promoting faster recovery [5]. The addition of both PaO₂ and SpO₂ monitoring in this study ensured a comprehensive assessment of respiratory function, allowing us to detect subtle improvements in oxygenation.

Surgical and Anesthesia Team Control: By standardizing the surgical and anesthesia teams for all procedures, we minimized potential confounders that could affect outcomes. Previous studies have highlighted the variability introduced by different surgical and anesthesia techniques, which can influence the incidence of PPCs [13]. By controlling these factors, we were able to attribute the differences in outcomes more directly to the intervention of preoperative IS, strengthening the internal validity of the study.

Role of Surgery Duration: The focus on midline laparotomies lasting more than 2 hours ensured that the patients selected for this study faced a higher risk of PPCs due to the prolonged duration of anesthesia and mechanical ventilation. Studies have shown that longer surgeries are associated with increased respiratory compromise postoperatively [8], making this population ideal for evaluating the benefits of IS. Our results confirm that preoperative IS can mitigate the additional respiratory risk associated with prolonged surgeries.

Secondary Outcomes - Mobilization and Pain: Early mobilization is another critical factor in reducing PPCs, as it

encourages deep breathing and enhances lung expansion. In our study, patients in the intervention group achieved earlier ambulation, with a mean time to first mobilization of 28 hours compared to 36 hours in the control group. Early mobilization has been linked to better postoperative respiratory function, and the faster recovery of these patients underscores the role of IS in improving overall recovery [15].

Postoperative pain was also significantly lower in the intervention group, as evidenced by lower VAS scores at 48 and 72 hours postoperatively (Table 5) (Figure 4). Lower pain levels are likely due to improved lung function, which reduces the need for shallow breathing and allows patients to engage in more effective coughing and lung expansion exercises postoperatively [16].

Comparison with Literature: The results of our study align with findings from international research that underscores the benefits of IS in preventing PPCs. For instance, Sweity et al. (2021) found that preoperative IS significantly reduced PPCs in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) surgery, a finding that parallels our results in the context of abdominal surgery [11]. While the surgical contexts differ, the consistency of these outcomes suggests that preoperative IS has a broad potential to improve pulmonary outcomes across various types of surgeries.

In contrast, some studies have reported mixed results regarding the efficacy of IS, particularly in lower-risk surgical populations. For example, Guimarães et al. (2009) and Thomas & McIntosh (1994) found limited benefits of IS in preventing PPCs in patients undergoing elective upper abdominal surgery, highlighting that the effectiveness of IS may be influenced by factors such as patient selection, type of surgery, and timing of intervention [17,18]. These findings suggest that while IS is beneficial, its impact may vary depending on how and when it is applied, and further research is needed to refine its use in different clinical settings.

In the context of Pakistan, where healthcare resources are often limited, simple and cost-effective interventions like IS could play a crucial role in improving surgical outcomes. A study by Malik et al. in a tertiary care hospital in Karachi reported a high incidence of PPCs following major gastrointestinal surgeries, attributing this to factors such as inadequate preoperative care and limited access to preventive measures like IS [19]. Our study provides evidence that preoperative IS could be a valuable tool in such settings, helping to reduce the burden of PPCs and associated healthcare costs.

Moreover, the reduction in hospital stay observed in our study has significant implications for healthcare systems, particularly in resource-constrained environments (Table 4). Shorter hospital stays not only reduce costs but also minimize the risk of hospital-acquired infections, which are a major

concern in low- and middle-income countries [20]. The finding that preoperative IS can contribute to such outcomes highlights its potential as a low-cost intervention that can be easily integrated into standard care protocols.

Clinical implications: The clinical implications of our findings are substantial. Incorporating preoperative IS into routine preoperative care could lead to a significant reduction in PPCs, improved postoperative respiratory function, and shorter hospital stays. This is particularly relevant in settings like Pakistan, where optimizing resource use and improving surgical outcomes are critical goals. By reducing the incidence of PPCs, preoperative IS can also contribute to better overall recovery, allowing patients to resume normal activities more quickly and reducing the likelihood of long-term respiratory issues.

The observed reduction in postoperative pain scores in the intervention group also suggests that preoperative IS may enhance pain management. Effective pain control is crucial for encouraging early mobilization and deep breathing exercises postoperatively, both of which are key to preventing PPCs [21]. By providing a non-pharmacological approach to pain management, preoperative IS could reduce the reliance on opioids and other pain medications, which have their own set of risks and complications.

Strengths and limitations: One of the key strengths of this study is its randomized controlled design, which minimizes selection bias and allows for direct comparisons between the intervention and control groups. The use of a standardized surgical team and consistent anesthesia techniques across all patients strengthens the study's internal validity, ensuring that observed differences are more likely due to IS intervention. Furthermore, the inclusion of specific criteria for PPCs and objective measures of oxygenation (PaO₂ and SpO₂) adds to the rigor of the study.

However, several limitations should be considered. First, the study was conducted at a single center with a relatively small sample size, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other populations or healthcare settings. Second, compliance with the IS protocol was self-reported, which could introduce bias, although daily logs were reviewed by clinical staff. Third, while the study included midline laparotomies, the results may not be generalizable to all types of abdominal surgeries, especially those with shorter durations.

Future research: Future studies should aim to confirm these findings in larger, multi-center trials, with a focus on assessing the long-term pulmonary outcomes of preoperative IS. Additionally, future research should explore the role of IS in other types of abdominal surgeries and investigate whether shorter preoperative IS interventions (less than one week) can achieve similar benefits. Finally, the cost-effectiveness

of preoperative IS in resource-limited settings should be explored, particularly in regions where surgical complications can have severe socioeconomic consequences.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that preoperative incentive spirometry (IS) significantly reduces postoperative pulmonary complications (PPCs) in patients undergoing elective midline laparotomies lasting more than 2 hours. Preoperative IS not only lowers the incidence of PPCs but also improves postoperative oxygenation, shortens the length of hospital stay, reduces postoperative pain, and facilitates earlier mobilization. By controlling for key variables such as surgical and anesthesia teams and focusing on a higher-risk population undergoing longer surgeries, this study provides robust evidence of the effectiveness of preoperative IS. These findings suggest that incorporating IS into preoperative care protocols could lead to improved patient outcomes, particularly in resource-limited settings where surgical complications have significant implications for both patients and healthcare systems.

Given the simplicity, low cost, and non-invasive nature of IS, its routine use in preoperative care is recommended for patients undergoing major abdominal surgeries. Future research should focus on expanding the use of preoperative IS to other types of surgeries and evaluating its long-term impact on respiratory function and recovery.

Funding

No funding was available, the study was self financed by the principal author.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest related to this research.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge students of Ameer ud Din Medical College for helping in data collection.

Author contributions

Dr Maham Arshad - Conceptualization, Data Curation, Writing – Original Draft, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing, Formal Analysis, Visualization, Supervision

Dr Azka Ashraf - Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing

Dr Ghanwa Muzammil - Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing

Dr Rohma Arshad - Conceptualization, Data Curation, Writing – Original Draft

Dr Awais Amjad Malik - Formal Analysis, Visualization, Supervision

Dr Jehanzaib Rashid - Formal Analysis, Visualization, Supervision

Ethical Approval

This study was approved by the Ethical Committee of Lahore General Hospital (Department of Surgery) with Ref No:128/SU-III.

References

- Miskovic A, Lumb AB. Postoperative pulmonary complications. *Br J Anaesth* 118 (2017): 317-334.
- Miskovic A, Lumb AB. Postoperative pulmonary complications in thoracic surgery. *Thorac Surg Clin* 30 (2020): 299-307.
- Canet J, Gallart L. Predicting postoperative pulmonary complications in the general population. *Eur Respir J* 35 (2010): 1230-1236.
- Serejo LG, Da Silva-Junior FP, Bastos JP, et al. Risk factors for pulmonary complications after emergency abdominal surgery. *Respir Med* 101 (2007): 808-813.
- Freitas ER, Soares BG, Cardoso JR, et al. Incentive spirometry for preventing pulmonary complications after coronary artery bypass graft. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 9 (2012): CD004466.
- Hulzebos EH, Helders PJ, Faviu NJ, et al. Preoperative intensive inspiratory muscle training to prevent postoperative pulmonary complications in high-risk patients undergoing CABG surgery: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 296 (2006): 1851-1857.
- Agostini P, Naidu B. Does preoperative physiotherapy reduce postoperative pulmonary complications in elective cardiac surgery? A systematic review. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 43 (2013): 829-835.
- Yang CK, Yoo JW, Jo JY, et al. Incidence and risk factors of postoperative pulmonary complications in patients undergoing laparoscopic abdominal surgery. *J Anesth* 28 (2014): 667-673.
- Lawrence VA, Dhanda R, Hilsenbeck SG, et al. Risk of pulmonary complications after elective abdominal surgery. *Chest* 110 (1996): 744-750.
- Canet J, Mazo V. Postoperative pulmonary complications. *Minerva Anestesiol* 76 (2010): 138-143.
- Sweity EM, Alkaissi AA, Othman W, et al. Preoperative incentive spirometry for preventing postoperative pulmonary complications in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass graft surgery: a prospective, randomized controlled trial. *J Cardiothorac Surg* 16 (2021): 241.
- Agostini P, Singh S, Grant R, et al. Incentive spirometry and early mobilization reduce pulmonary complications after abdominal surgery: a randomized controlled trial. *Ann Thorac Surg* 95 (2013): 2020-2027.
- Lawrence VA, Cornell JE, Smetana GW. Strategies to reduce postoperative pulmonary complications after noncardiothoracic surgery: systematic review for the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med* 144 (2006): 596-608.
- Shweiki E, Abougergi MS, Choi JJ, et al. Pulmonary complications in emergency general surgery: incidence, risk factors, and outcomes. *Am J Surg* 210 (2015): 892-898.
- Kehlet H. Multimodal approach to control postoperative pathophysiology and rehabilitation. *Br J Anaesth* 78 (1997): 606-617.
- Overend TJ, Anderson CM, Lucy SD, et al. The effect of incentive spirometry on postoperative pulmonary complications: a systematic review. *Chest* 120 (2001): 971-978.
- Guimarães MM, El Dib R, Smith AF, et al. Incentive spirometry for prevention of postoperative pulmonary complications in upper abdominal surgery. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* (2009): CD006058.
- Thomas JA, McIntosh JM. Are incentive spirometry, intermittent positive pressure breathing, and deep breathing exercises effective in the prevention of postoperative pulmonary complications after upper abdominal surgery? A systematic overview and meta-analysis. *Phys Ther* 74 (1994): 3-10.
- Malik AM, Laghari AA, Mallah Q, et al. Postoperative complications of major gastrointestinal surgery: a retrospective analysis. *Med Channel* 16 (2010): 101-105.
- Allegranzi B, Bagheri NS, Combescure C, et al. Burden of endemic health-care-associated infection in developing countries: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 377 (2011): 228-241.
- Kehlet H, Jensen TS, Woolf CJ. Persistent postsurgical pain: risk factors and prevention. *Lancet* 367 (2006): 1618-1625.