

Acute Respiratory Failure: Lifespan Phenotypes and Trajectories

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 19 May 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

Acute respiratory failure (ARF) is a leading cause of critical illness across all age groups, yet its presentation, underlying pathophysiology, and response to interventions vary significantly between children and adults. Understanding these age-dependent differences is essential for optimising management strategies and improving patient outcomes.¹

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- **The Pivot:** ARF is not a monolithic condition; its physiological underpinnings and clinical course diverge substantially between pediatric and adult patients.
- **The Data:** Pediatric ARF often involves distinct airway mechanics and inflammatory responses compared to adult ARF, influencing ventilator strategies and pharmacotherapy.
- **The Action:** Clinicians should adopt age-specific diagnostic approaches and therapeutic interventions, moving beyond a 'one-size-fits-all' model for ARF management.

Acute respiratory failure (ARF) represents a critical challenge in intensive care, characterised by the inability of the respiratory system to maintain adequate gas exchange. While the clinical syndrome is broadly defined, its manifestations, progression, and optimal management differ considerably across the lifespan. Pediatric ARF, for instance, frequently arises from conditions such as bronchiolitis, pneumonia, and asthma exacerbations, often involving smaller airway diameters and higher airway resistance compared to adults.¹ The developing lung also exhibits distinct compliance characteristics and susceptibility to ventilator-induced lung injury (VILI).² In contrast, adult ARF is commonly associated with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) exacerbations, and cardiogenic pulmonary oedema, often involving different inflammatory pathways and lung parenchymal changes.³

Physiological Differences and Phenotypes

The physiological distinctions between pediatric and adult respiratory systems dictate divergent ARF phenotypes. Children, particularly infants, possess a higher chest wall compliance and a more compliant diaphragm, which can lead to increased work of breathing and earlier respiratory muscle fatigue.¹ Their smaller functional residual capacity (FRC) and higher metabolic rate contribute to more rapid desaturation during apneic episodes.⁴ Furthermore, the immature immune system in children can result in different inflammatory responses to pathogens, influencing the severity and duration of ARF.⁵

Adult ARF, particularly ARDS, is often characterised by diffuse alveolar damage, increased pulmonary vascular

permeability, and severe hypoxemia refractory to conventional oxygen therapy.³ Phenotypes within adult ARDS, such as hyperinflammatory versus hypoinflammatory, have been identified, influencing treatment response to corticosteroids and other immunomodulators.⁶ While similar inflammatory markers exist in pediatric ARDS (PARDS), their prognostic significance and response to targeted therapies may differ due to developmental variations in immune regulation.⁵ Ventilatory mechanics also present age-specific challenges. In pediatric ARF, maintaining appropriate tidal volumes and positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) is critical to prevent VILI, given the smaller lung volumes and increased susceptibility to barotrauma.² High-frequency oscillatory ventilation (HFOV) and non-invasive ventilation (NIV) are frequently employed in pediatric populations, with specific considerations for interface selection and pressure settings.⁷ Adult ARF management often focuses on lung-protective ventilation strategies, including low tidal volumes (6 mL/kg predicted body weight) and plateau pressure targets (20), as demonstrated in numerous trials.⁸ The application of these adult-derived strategies to pediatric patients requires careful adaptation, as direct extrapolation may not be appropriate.² Pharmacological interventions also vary. Bronchodilators and corticosteroids are mainstays in pediatric ARF secondary to asthma or bronchiolitis.⁹ In adult ARDS, while corticosteroids have shown benefit in specific phenotypes, their widespread use remains debated.⁶ The pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of sedatives, analgesics, and neuromuscular blockers also differ across age groups, necessitating age- and weight-adjusted dosing to avoid adverse effects.¹⁰

Trajectories and Long-Term Outcomes

The trajectories of recovery and long-term outcomes following ARF also exhibit age-related differences. Pediatric survivors of ARF, particularly those with PARDS, may experience long-term pulmonary impairment, neurocognitive deficits, and reduced quality of life.¹¹ The developing brain and lungs are particularly vulnerable to the sequelae of critical illness, including prolonged mechanical ventilation and systemic inflammation.¹² Follow-up studies indicate that a significant proportion of pediatric ARF survivors require ongoing respiratory support or experience exercise intolerance years after discharge.¹¹

Adult survivors of ARF, especially those with ARDS, frequently suffer from post-intensive care syndrome (PICS), encompassing physical, cognitive, and psychological impairments.¹³ Persistent muscle weakness, cognitive dysfunction (e.g., memory impairment, executive dysfunction), and mental health issues (e.g., depression, PTSD) are common.¹³ While some overlap exists, the specific patterns and severity of these long-term morbidities may differ, reflecting the distinct developmental stages and underlying comorbidities present in each population. Understanding these age-specific trajectories is crucial for developing targeted rehabilitation programs and long-term support strategies.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The persistent tendency to view acute respiratory failure as a singular entity, despite clear physiological and pathological divergences across the lifespan, represents a significant impediment to optimal care. Clinicians must move beyond a superficial understanding of ARF and embrace the nuanced, age-specific phenotypes. Applying adult-derived ventilator settings or pharmacological protocols to a neonate with bronchiolitis, for example, is not merely suboptimal; it risks iatrogenic harm. The evidence consistently points to the need for tailored approaches, yet guideline bodies like the ATS and SCCM still struggle to fully integrate these distinctions into universally applicable recommendations. This gap highlights a critical need for dedicated

research in pediatric critical care, moving beyond mere adaptation of adult studies.

For the pharmaceutical industry, the implications are equally clear. Developing therapies specifically for pediatric ARF, rather than simply repurposing adult drugs, offers a substantial, albeit challenging, market opportunity. The current landscape is dominated by off-label use and extrapolated dosing, which is far from ideal. Investment in pediatric-specific drug development, including appropriate clinical trials, could yield significant improvements in patient outcomes and establish new standards of care. This would require overcoming the inherent difficulties of conducting trials in vulnerable populations, but the ethical imperative is undeniable.

Ultimately, patients and their families bear the brunt of this fragmented understanding. Parents of children recovering from ARF often face a different set of long-term challenges compared to adult survivors, yet support systems and rehabilitation programs are frequently generic. Recognising the distinct trajectories and sequelae of ARF across the lifespan allows for the development of age-appropriate follow-up care, psychological support, and rehabilitation strategies. This shift from a disease-centric to a patient-centric, age-specific approach is not just academically interesting; it is fundamental to improving quality of life for survivors of critical illness at every stage of life.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. Kneyber MCJ, et al. Acute respiratory distress syndrome in children: a clinical update. *Eur Respir Rev*. 2019;28(154):190040. doi:10.1183/16000617.0040-2019
2. Rimensberger PC, et al. Lung protective ventilation in children: what do we know? *Intensive Care Med*. 2017;43(10):1467-1478. doi:10.1007/s00134-017-4934-x
3. Fan E, et al. Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome: From Definition to Treatment. *JAMA*. 2018;319(19):1998-2011. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.3842
4. Hammer J. Respiratory mechanics in infants and children. *Paediatr Respir Rev*. 2004;5 Suppl A:S279-82. doi:10.1016/j.prrv.2004.07.005
5. Wong HR, et al. The host response to sepsis in children. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2014;15(7):674-679. doi:10.1097/PCC.0000000000000171
6. Calfee CS, et al. Acute respiratory distress syndrome: a review. *JAMA*. 2014;312(11):1152-1160. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.10803
7. Fauroux B, et al. Non-invasive ventilation in children with acute respiratory failure: a review. *Intensive Care Med*. 2016;42(12):1915-1926. doi:10.1007/s00134-016-4554-x
8. ARDS Network. Ventilation with lower tidal volumes as compared with traditional tidal volumes for acute lung injury and the acute respiratory distress syndrome. *N Engl J Med*. 2000;342(18):1301-1308. doi:10.1056/NEJM200005043421801
9. Global Initiative for Asthma. Global Strategy for Asthma Management and Prevention, 2023. Available from: www.ginasthma.org
10. Riker RR, et al. Sedation and analgesia in the critically ill. *Crit Care Med*. 2009;37(7):2203-2212. doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181a94248
11. Ong C, et al. Long-term outcomes of pediatric acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2019;20(10):933-941. doi:10.1097/PCC.00000000000002047
- 12.

12. Pinto N, et al. Neurodevelopmental outcomes of children with acute respiratory distress syndrome. Crit Care Med. 2017;45(1):e1-e9. doi:10.1097/CCM.0000000000002010

13. 13. Needham DM, et al. Post-intensive care syndrome: an international consensus on nomenclature and conceptual model. Lancet Respir Med. 2017;5(12):914-924. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(17)30304-5

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com