

Use of Driving Pressure and Transpulmonary Pressure for Morbidly Obese and ARDS Patients!

John Emberger RRT-ACCS CPHQ FAARC Director – Respiratory Care ChristianaCare – Newark Delaware jemberger@christianacare.org



Lecture Objectives

- Define and describe the terms "driving pressure" and "transpulmonary pressure"
- Discuss how driving and transpulmonary pressures are affected in patients with morbid obesity and ARDS
- Discuss how driving and transpulmonary pressures can be utilized to assist in the care of patients with morbid obesity and ARDS



Road Map

Background

<u>ARD</u>S

- Driving Pressure
- Esophageal Balloon / Transpulmonary Pressure

Obesity

- Driving Pressure
- Esophageal Balloon / Transpulmonary Pressure

Quick Demonstration

Summary / Key Take Home Points

anaCare[®]



Background



ChristianaCare



Stress – force per unit area Strain – change in length vs original length



FIFTY YEARS OF RESEARCH IN ARDS Setting Positive End-Expiratory Pressure in Acute Respiratory Distress Am J Respir Crit Care Med Vol 195, Iss 11, pp 1429–1438, Jun 1, 2017

Sarina K. Sahetya¹, Ewan C. Goligher^{2,3}, and Roy G. Brower¹



"No single method of PEEP titration has been shown to improve clinical outcomes compared with other approaches of setting PEEP"

Figure 1. Mechanisms of ventilator-induced lung injury. *Left panel* shows lung regions at endexpiration. *Right panel* shows the same lung regions at end-inspiration. (A) Patent alveoli are overdistended or stretched to injurious volumes. (B) Some tissue may be injured by excessive stress at the margins between atelectatic and aerated alveoli. (C) Small bronchioles and alveoli may be injured by mechanical forces involved in repeated opening and closing. Reprinted with permission from Reference 80.







Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

High versus low positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) levels for mechanically ventilated adult patients with acute lung injury and acute respiratory distress syndrome (Review)

Santa Cruz R, Rojas JI, Nervi R, Heredia R, Ciapponi A

Meta-analysis revealed <u>no statistically significant differences</u> between the two groups nor was any statistically significant difference seen in the risk of barotrauma - Oxygenation was improved in the high-PEEP group

| Study or subgroup | High PEEP | Low PEEP | Risk Ratio | | | | Weight | Risk Ratio | |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----|------------|------|--------|------------------|--------------------|
| 이 것이다 다음 모두는 | n/N | n/N | | M-H | Fixed, 959 | % CI | | | M-H, Fixed, 95% CI |
| Brower 2004 | 69/276 | 75/273 | | | + | | | 17.82% | 0.91[0.69,1.21] |
| Meade 2008 | 173/475 | 205/508 | | | - | | | 46.82% | 0.9[0.77,1.06] |
| Mercat 2008 | 136/385 | 149/382 | | | | | | 35.35% | 0.91[0.75,1.09 |
| Total (95% CI) | 1136 | 1163 | | | | | | 100% | 0.9[0.81,1.01] |
| Total events: 378 (High PEEP), 4 | 129 (Low PEEP) | | | | | | | | |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² =0; Chi ² =0, | df=2(P=1); I ² =0% | | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect: Z=1.76(P | =0.08) | | | | | | - | | |
| | F | avours High PEEP | 0.01 | 0.1 | 1 | 10 | 100 | Favours Low PEEP | |

Meta-analysis

ChristianaCare

Defining Terms: Driving Pressure

- 1. Plat (cmH2O) PEEP (cmH2O), generally want < 15
- 2. Inspiratory Pressure with zero flow (cmH2O) PEEP (cmH2O)
- 3. Tidal Volume (ml) ÷ Respiratory System Compliance (ml / cmH2O)





Defining Terms: Transpulmonary Pressure

Transpulmonary pressure (TPP) = airway pressure - pleural pressure Generally, want (+) end expiratory and < 10 to 15 end inspiratory



Figure 2. The clinician can directly measure the pressure from the ventilator at the airway opening (airway pressure [Paw]) and reference it to body surface pressure (Pbs). Esophageal pressure (Pes) may also be directly measured with a balloon manometer. Transpulmonary pressure (PL) = Paw – Pes. The alveolar pressure (Palv) can be measured from Paw during end-inspirator (plateau) and end-expiratory (total positive end-expiratory pressure) holds. Abdominal pressure (Pab) can be measured in the stomach or the bladder. Abdo = abdomen. Artwork by Vicky Earle.



TPP & Driving Pressure: ARDS





ANESTHESIOLOGY

Driving Pressure Is Associated with Outcome during Assisted Ventilation in Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome Retrospective

Anesthesiology 2019; 131:594–604 retrospective study of 154 ARDS patients





Dynamic Airway Driving Pressure and Outcomes in Children With Acute Hypoxemic Respiratory Failure

Respir Care 2021;66(3):403–409, n=161 pediatrics 1 to 15 years old Abdul Rauf, Anil Sachdev, Shekhar T Venkataraman, and Veronique Dinand

| Pressure Groups | _ow DP < 15 | High DP > 1 | 5 | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|--|
| Outcome | $Low \Delta P (n = 47)$ | High ΔP ($n = 54$) | Р | |
| ARDS, n | 29 | 36 | | |
| Duration of ventilation, d | | | | |
| Total | 5 (4-6) | 8 (6-11) | < .001 | |
| ARDS | 6 (4-7) | 9 (6-12) | < .001 | |
| Ventilator-free days at day 28, d | | | | |
| Total | 23 (20-24) | 17 (0-22) | < .001 | |
| ARDS | 22 (19-23) | 16 (0-21) | < .001 | |
| ICU length of stay, d | | | | |
| Total | 6 (5-8) | 12 (7-15) | < .001 | |
| ARDS | 7 (6–9) | 14 (7–15) | < .001 | |
| Hospital length of stay, d | | | | |
| Total | 11 (7-14) | 18 (13-25) | < .001 | |
| ARDS | 12 (8–15) | 19 (13-25) | < .001 | |
| In-hospital mortality, % | | | | |
| Total | 17 | 24 | .38 | |
| ARDS | 18 | 25 | .33 | |

Retrospective





Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2021 Mar 30. doi: 10.1164/rccm.202009-3467OC. Online ahead of print.

Ventilatory Variables and Mechanical Power in Patients with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome 4,549 ARDS patients in a pooled database

Eduardo L V Costa ¹², Arthur Slutsky ³⁴, Laurent J Brochard ⁴³, Roy Brower ⁵, Ary Serpa-Neto ⁶, Alexandre B Cavalcanti ⁷, Alain Mercat ⁸, Maureen Meade ⁹, Caio C A Morais ¹⁰, Ewan Goligher ¹¹³ Carlos R R Carvalho ¹², Marcelo B P Amato ¹

Pooled data from Retrospective and Prospective RCT's

Driving Pressure and RR = significantly associated with mortality



Driving Pressure and Survival in the Acute **Respiratory Distress Syndrome**

N Engl J Med 2015;372:747-55, 3562 patients from previous studies Marcelo B.P. Amato, M.D., Maureen O. Meade, M.D., Arthur S. Slutsky, M.D., Laurent Brochard, M.D., Eduardo L.V. Costa, M.D., David A. Schoenfeld, Ph.D., Pooled data from **Previous RCT's**



Decreasing DP with changed vent settings was associated with increased survival

ESTABLISHED IN 1812

NOVEMBER 13, 2008

VOL. 359 NO. 20

N Engl J Med 2008;359:2095-104. n=61 "EPVent 1" Mechanical Ventilation Guided by Esophageal Pressure in Acute Lung Injury

Daniel Talmor, M.D., M.P.H., Todd Sarge, M.D., Atul Malhotra, M.D., Carl R. O'Donnell, Sc.D., M.P.H., Ray Ritz, R.R.T., Alan Lisbon, M.D., Victor Novack, M.D., Ph.D., and Stephen H. Loring, M.D.



| Table 4. Clinical Outcomes.* | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Outcome | Esophageal-Pressure–Guided (N = 30) | Conventional Treatment (N=31) | P Value | | | | | | |
| 28-Day mortality — no. (%) | 5 (17) | 12 (39) | 0.055 | | | | | | |
| 180-Day mortality — no. (%) | 8 (27) | 14 (45) | 0.13 | | | | | | |
| Length of ICU stay — days | | | 0.16 | | | | | | |
| Median | 15.5 | 13.0 | | | | | | | |
| Interquartile range | 10.8–28.5 | 7.0–22.0 | | | | | | | |



Prospective RCT





ESTABLISHED IN 1812

NOVEMBER 13, 2008

VOL. 359 NO. 20

N Engl J Med 2008;359:2095-104. n=61

Mechanical Ventilation Guided by Esophageal Pressure in Acute Lung Injury

Table 4. Clinical Outcomes.*

| Outcome | Esophageal-Pressure–Guided (N = 30) | Conventional Treatment (N=31) | P Value | |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---------|--|
| 28-Day mortality — no. (%) | 5 (17) | 12 (39) | 0.055 | |
| 180-Day mortality — no. (%) | 8 (27) | 14 (45) | 0.13 | |
| Length of ICU stay — days | | | 0.16 | |
| Median | 15.5 | 13.0 | | |
| Interquartile range | 10.8–28.5 | 7.0–22.0 | | |







0 1

2 3

4 5

Time in Study, d

7

6

JAMA | Original Investigation | CARING FOR THE CRITICALLY ILL PATIENT

Effect of Titrating Positive End-Expiratory Pressure (PEEP) With an Esophageal Pressure–Guided Strategy vs an Empirical High PEEP-FIO₂ Strategy on Death and Days Free From Mechanical Ventilation Among Patients With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome A Randomized Clinical Trial JAMA. 2019;321(9):846-857, n=200 Balloon vs high PEEP table **Prospective RCT**

"EPVent 2"









"Among patients with moderate to severe ARDS, PES-guided PEEP, compared with empirical high PEEP-FIO2, resulted in no significant difference in death and days free from mechanical ventilation. These findings do not support PES-guided PEEP <u>titration in ARDS</u>" JAMA | Original Investigation | CARING FOR THE CRITICALLY ILL PATIENT Effect of Titrating Positive End-Expiratory Pressure (PEEP) With an Esophageal Pressure-Guided Strategy vs an Empirical High PEEP-EIQ- Strategy on Death and Days Free From



JAMA | Original Investigation | CARING FOR THE CRITICALLY ILL PATIENT

Effect of Titrating Positive End-Expiratory Pressure (PEEP) With an Esophageal Pressure–Guided Strategy vs an Empirical High PEEP-FIO₂ Strategy on Death and Days Free From Mechanical Ventilation Among Patients With Acute



titration in ARDS"





ESTABLISHED IN 1812



EPVent 1 - Balloon vs low PEEP - Balloon Better??? Mechanical Ventilation Guided by Esophageal Pressure in Acute Lung Injury

JAMA | Original Investigation | CARING FOR THE CRITICALLY ILL PATIENT

Effect of Titrating Positive End-Expiratory Pressure (PEEP) With an Esophageal Pressure-Guided Strategy vs an Empirical High PEEP-FIO₂ Strategy on Death and Days Free From Mechanical Ventilation Among Patients With Acute **Respiratory Distress Syndrome** EPVent 2 - Balloon vs high A Randomized Clinical Trial **PEEP – No Difference**



Driving pressure and long-term outcomes in moderate/severe acute respiratory distress

Prospective not an RCT

syndrome

Ann Intensive Care (2018) 8:119, n=33 ARDS pts @ 6 months



We already know ARDS long term outcomes include: cognitive, psychiatric & physical issues

<u>Higher driving pressure</u> = worse long-term pulmonary function and structure even with "protective ventilation"



TPP & Driving Pressure: Obesity



Anesthesiology 1999; 91:1221-31 © 1999 American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Inc.

Positive End-expiratory Pressure Improves Respiratory Function in Obese but not in Normal Subjects during Anesthesia and Paralysis

Paolo Pelosi, M.D.,* Irene Ravagnan, M.D.,† Gabriella Giurati, M.D.,† Mauro Panigada, M.D.,‡ Nicola Bottino, M.D.,‡ Stefano Tredici, M.D.,‡ Giuditta Eccher, M.D.,‡ Luciano Gattinoni, M.D.§

"PEEP improves respiratory function in morbidly obese patients but not in normal subjects"



Protective mechanical ventilation in the obese patient Falcão et al. International Anesthesiology Clinics (2020) 58:3

Luiz F.d.R. Falcão, MD, MBA, PhD, TSA^a, Paolo Pelosi, MD, FERS^{b,c}, Marcelo Gama de Abreu, MD, MSc, PhD, DESA^d

Pulmonary function abnormalities resulting from obesity during spontaneous breathing

> Respiratory muscle function impairment ↑ work of breathing ↓ lung compliance ↓ lung volumes ↑ airway resistance Heterogeneity of ventilation distribution



Pulmonary function abnormalities resulting from obesity during mechanical ventilation

- ↓ end-expiratory lung volume
- ↑↑ atelectasis
- Preferential ventilation in non-dependent regions
- ↑ physiological shunt
- ↑ ventilation-perfusion mismatch
- ↓ arterial oxygenation
- ↓ respiratory system compliance
- ↑ intrapleural pressure

Protective mechanical ventilation in obese patients

- ✓ PCV, VCV or PCV-VG
- ✓ Respiratory ratio 1:1 or 1.5:1
- ✓ V_T 6 to 8 mL/kg PBW
- ✓ PEEP \leq 5 cmH₂O

- ✓ No recruitment maneuvers (RM)
- ✓ FiO₂ to assure SpO₂ ≥ 90%, if FiO₂ alone is not sufficient, consider increase PEEP and RM
- ✓ Increases in driving pressure resulting from adjustments in PEEP should be ideally avoided

tianaCare[®]



<u>Non-obese patients</u> – Increases in DP, Plat and Compliance are independently associated with mortality <u>Obese patients</u> – increases in DP, Plat and Compliance are not associated mortality

🐼 ChristianaCare

ANESTHESIOLOGY

Pooled data from a prospective and retrospective study

Prevalence of Complete Airway Closure According to Body Mass Index in Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome

Anesthesiology 2020; 133:867–78, n=51 Pooled Cohort Analysis

• PEEP needed to keep airways open?

• PEEP needed to keep TPPee positive?





Recruitment Maneuvers and Positive End-Expiratory Pressure Titration in Morbidly Obese ICU Patients Dese ICU Patients Dese ICU Patients Crit Care Med 2016; 44:300–307 Description of titrating positive end-expiratory pressure for BMI >35

Prospective not an RCT

n=14, two methods of titrating positive end-expiratory pressure for BMI >35 Massimiliano Pirrone, MD^{1,2}; Daniel Fisher, RRT³; Daniel Chipman, RRT³; David A. E. Imber, BA¹;

Javier Corona, MD^{1,4}; Cristina Mietto, MD^{1,2}; Robert M. Kacmarek, RRT, PhD^{1,3}; Lorenzo Berra, MD¹

TABLE 1. Characteristics of Study Patients

| Total number of patients enrolled | 14 |
|--|------------------|
| Age, mean \pm sD, yr | 54.0 ± 15.7 |
| Female, <i>n</i> (%) | 6 (42.9) |
| Height, mean \pm sD, cm 5.5 ft | 170.9 ± 12.5 |
| Weight, mean ± sp, kg 321 lbs | 146.1 ± 40.8 |
| Body mass index, mean \pm sp, kg/m ² | 50.7 ± 16.0 |
| Thoracic circumference, mean \pm sD, cm 57 in | 144.8±23.3 |
| Abdominal circumference, mean \pm sp, cm 59 ir | 151.8±23.8 |

TABLE 2. Respiratory Mechanics and Gas Exchange at Different Positive End-Expiratory Pressure Levels

| | Baseline | Zero PEEP ^a | Lowest PEEP With Positive Ptpe | Lowest PEEP With Positive Ptpe After RM | Best Decremental PEEP After RM | Best Decremental PEEP-Head of Bed 30 Degree |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| PEEP cm H ₂ O | 11.6±2.9 | 0 | 20.7 ± 4.0^{b} | $20.7\pm4.0^{\scriptscriptstyle b}$ | 21.3±3.8 [⊾] | 21.5±3.7⁵ |
| End-expiratory lung volume, mL/kg ideal body weight | 19.5±8.3 25+ ml/kg | 14.6±3.9 | 27.1±9.2 | $30.1 \pm 8.2^{b,c}$ | 30.6±8.7⁵ | 38.5±11.5⁵ |
| Ppeak, cm H ₂ O | 34.6±5.8 | 22.4 ± 4.9 | 41.7 ± 6.0^{b} | $40.2 \pm 6.1^{b,c}$ | 40.4 ± 5.2^{b} | 41.6±5.5 ^b |
| Pplat, cm H ₂ O | 22.5 ± 4.1 | 11.7 ± 2.1 | 30.4±4.2 ^b | $29.1 \pm 4.1^{b,c}$ | $29.8\pm3.8^{\text{b}}$ | 30.8±3.2 ^b |
| Pao ₂ /Fio ₂ , torr | 179±60 | | | 270±67 ^b | 266±72 ^b | |
| Ptpi, cm H _o O | 1.6±5.0 | -3.2±2.8 | 8.1±2.5 ^b | $6.6 \pm 3.3^{b,c}$ | $7.5 \pm 2.6^{\text{b}}$ | 10.3±3.8 ^b |
| Ptpe, cm H ₂ O | -5.8 ± 5.8 | -11.5 ± 1.7^{b} | 1.1±1.5⁵ | 1.4 ± 2.4^{b} | $2.3 \pm 2.3^{\text{b}}$ | 4.2±3.8 ^b |

Commonly used PEEP levels for morbidly obese patients are too low, cause atelectasis and hypoxemia – TPP or decremental trails with RM's may benefit these patients





Transpulmonary Pressure Describes Lung **Morphology During Decremental Positive** End-Expiratory Pressure Trials in Obesity*

Prospective not an RCT

Crit Care Med 2017; 45:1374–1381, n=16 crit ill obese patients (most 300-400lbs) Jacopo Fumagalli, MD^{1,2}; Lorenzo Berra, MD¹; Changsheng Zhang, MD, PhD¹; Massimiliano Pirrone, MD^{1,2};

TABLE 1. Patients' Respiratory Parameters

| Respiratory Parameters, <i>n</i> = 16 | Baseline | Optimal PEEP | p |
|---|----------------|----------------|---------|
| PEEP (cm H ₂ O) | 12.7±2.9 | → 21.7±3.7 | < 0.001 |
| Plateau pressure (cm H ₂ O) | 23.8 ± 3.4 | 28.3 ± 4.3 | < 0.001 |
| Peak pressure (cm H_2O) | 33.3±65.1 | 38.8 ± 4.9 | < 0.001 |
| End-inspiratory transpulmonary pressure (cm H ₂ O) | 2.5±5.1 | 6.1±3.2 | 0.001 |
| End-expiratory transpulmonary pressure (cm H_2O) | -4.4±4.6 | → 2.1±2.0 | < 0.001 |
| End-expiratory lung volume (mL/kg ideal body weight) | 19.6±8.0 | 30.4 ± 9.1 | < 0.001 |
| Elastance of the respiratory system (cm H ₂ O/L) | 23.9±7.1 - | → 18.6±6.1 | < 0.001 |
| Elastance of the lung (cm H_2O/L) | 16.6 ± 5.1 | 10.8 ± 4.3 | < 0.001 |
| Elastance of the chest wall (cm H_2O/L) | 7.2 ± 2.9 | 7.7 ± 3.5 | 0.547 |
| Pao ₂ /Fio ₂ | 163.4±56.7 | 273.4±72.1 | < 0.001 |
| Paco ₂ (mm Hg) | 47.9±13.4 | 50.9±11.6 | 0.140 |

Optimizing the PEEP with TPP and/or decremental PEEP Trial





Transpulmonary Pressure-Guided Lung-Protective Ventilation Improves Pulmonary Mechanics and Oxygenation Among Obese Subjects on Mechanical Ventilation

RESPIRATORY CARE Paper in Press. Published on 20 April, 2021, n=20

Daniel D Rowley, Susan R Arrington, Kyle B Enfield, Keith D Lamb, Alexandra Kadl, John P Davis, and Danny J Theodore



Results: higher PEEP, lower FIO2 , better pulmonary mechanics, and higher oxygenation for adult obese subjects

Retrospective

aCare[®]









Retrospective

- Single center <u>retrospective study</u> at MGH
- Class III Obesity (BMI > 40) with ARDS and mechanical ventilation > 48 hours
- Compared ARDSnet Low PEEP Table to PEEP settings determined by a Lung Rescue Team using:
 - Lung recruitment maneuvers
 - Esophageal manometry
 - Hemodynamic monitoring
- Decreased mortality in the group with settings determined by the Lung Rescue Team

ChristianaCare[®]



"We found that in patients with an average BMI of > 50 kg/m2, an individualized lung rescue approach based on individualized cardiopulmonary physiology is associated with a decreased in-hospital mortality"

ChristianaCare



Esophageal Balloon: The ChristianaCare Experience

44 esophageal balloon patients (out of 2205 vent patients Dec 2019-Sep2020) •2% of ventilator patients used a balloon (balloons are ~\$40)

We increased PEEP an average of 6 cmH2O above standard clinical PEEP settings prior to balloon use (next slide)

Patients with BMI > 35 and high PEEP requirements outcomes were compared to the previous year without balloon management:

2020 population with balloon management resulted in 8% reduction in mortality







Further Analysis

52 patients – 92% success rate inserting balloon

31 Patients with BMI > 35

| | EndInsp | End Exp | SpO2 | FiO2 | PEEP | MAP | DP | PLAT | PIP | Vt | Vt ml/kg | Cst |
|------------------------|---------|---------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|----------|------|
| Baseline | | | 94.6 | 79.8 | 12.8 | 19.1 | 15.2 | 28.5 | 44.6 | 428.7 | 6.9 | 28.9 |
| Optimized with Balloon | 10.3 | -0.9 | 96.7 | 57.1 | 19.2 | 25.0 | 13.3 | 31.9 | 45.3 | 436.3 | 6.9 | 36.0 |
| Change | | | 2.1 | -22.7 | 6.4 | 5.9 | -2.1 | 4.6 | 0.7 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 8.3 |





Demonstration



Bedside Components Needed

- <u>Pressure Monitor</u> Patient Monitor with pressure measurement module
- <u>Transducer set</u> and cable
- Syringe
- <u>Catheter with Balloon</u> we use Cooper Surgical





ChristianaCare

Closer Look at the Catheter

- <u>Balloon</u> Cooper Surgical adult esophageal balloon, 5 french
- <u>Stylet</u>









- Recruited well ventilating
- No pleural pressure on the chest







Lab Setup: High Pleural Pressure

- Lung collapse that can occur with morbid obesity, abdominal distension etc..
- Negative expiratory transpulmonary pressure
- Means that pressure pushing on the lungs > pressure in the lungs









Patient Example

- Catheter is inserted to ~60 cm
- Verifying that the balloon catheter made it into the stomach by gently pushing on the stomach











Patient Example (2 patient examples)

- After verifying stomach placement
- Pull catheter back to distal third of the esophagus and above the diaphragm (~40 cm deep)
- Proper placement











Patient Example – End Exp TPP

- 4 second expiratory hold without patient effort
- Monitor is in mmhg and ventilator is in cmH2O
- We have conversion factors to cmH2O









Lab Example: Recruit the Lung with High Pleural Pressure

Collapsed ventilated lung

• Determine what PEEP will get the End Expiratory TPP upto O or slightly positive







Summary / Take Home Points

<u>TPP</u> – measured with an esophageal balloon <u>Driving Pressure</u> – Ventilating Pressure

ARDS Patients:

- <u>TPP</u> hopeful for improved management of ARDS? EPVent 1 & 2
- <u>DP</u> correlates to mortality, keep under 15

Morbidly Obese Patients:

- <u>TPP</u> manage PEEP needs to keep pleural pressure (+) and avoid lung collapse
- <u>DP</u> does not seem to correlate to mortality in this population





Thank you!

John Emberger RRT-ACCS CPHQ FAARC Director – Respiratory Care ChristianaCare – Newark Delaware jemberger@christianacare.org

