Comparison of the Ease of Insertion of the Laryngeal Tube VBM™ and Laryngeal Mask Airway During Manual in-Line Neck Stabilization

M Noor Zairul, MMed, A Khairul Faizi, MMed, E Norzalina, MMed
Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, Sarawak General Hospital, Kuching, Sarawak, 93050 Malaysia

Summary
The purpose of this study is to assess whether the newly developed laryngeal tube (LT) VBM™ is easy, simple to use and able to provide adequate ventilation and oxygenation in a patient with an unstable neck who required airway management. We compared the LT to the laryngeal mask airway (LMA) as alternative airway management tool in adult patient with unstable neck who underwent intubation with manual in-line neck stabilization. A randomized single-blinded prospective study was conducted involving a total of 40 ASA I and II premedicated patients who were divided into two groups with 20 patients each group; either LT or LMA group for airway management during elective surgery. After preoxygenation, anaesthesia was induced and neuromuscular blockade was produced with intravenous drugs. The LT or LMA was inserted after neuromuscular blockade was confirmed using a peripheral nerve stimulator (TOF 1). A size 3, 4 or 5 LT or a size 3 or 4 LMA was inserted while the patient's head and neck were being stabilized by an assistant who held the sides of the neck and the mastoid processes (manual in-line stabilization). If it was not possible to ventilate the lungs, or if endotracheal carbon dioxide (ETCO₂) and/or chest movement did not indicate a patent airway, the LT or LMA was removed. After three failed attempts, the study was terminated and the airway was secured in the most suitable manner determined by the anaesthetist. There was a statistically significant difference for both groups in the time required for successful insertion (time required for LT was 24.8 ± 7.7 seconds and LMA was 36.1 ± 17.3 seconds) (p= 0.01). There was no statistical differences (p>0.05) in number of attempts needed to achieve a patent airway although we were able to achieve a clear airway in all patients in LT group at the first attempt compared with 85% in LMA group. The successful insertion rate was 100% for both groups. We conclude that the LT is easier to insert and is a suitable alternative to the LMA for airway management when the patient's head and neck are stabilized by manual in-line method.
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Introduction
The laryngeal tube (VBM, Germany) is a multiple use, single lumen silicon tube with an angle of about 130 degrees and a blind tip. The tube is short with an S-shape, making blind insertion possible without tracheal intubation or irritation of the vocal cords and trachea. It has two cuffs (proximal and distal) connected to a single pilot balloon and two oval holes. The holes are placed in between the cuffs to provide the route for ventilation and allow suctioning and bronchoscopy with fiberscope. The larger proximal cuff (pharyngeal cuff) stabilizes the tube and blocks the naso- and oropharynx. The smaller distal cuff (oesophageal cuff) is
attacked at the tip of the tube and when inflated, sealed the oesophageal inlet. This reduces the possibility of gastric ventilation. Both cuffs are high volume, low pressure cuffs which provide good seal and protect from ischaemic damage. There are markings at the proximal end of the tube which is the depth mark, a thick black line in the centre and two thinner lines which indicates the range of depth where the tube can be repositioned to allow sufficient ventilation. This mark, when correctly positioned, lies at the level of the upper incisor teeth. There is a standard 15mm connector at the proximal end of the tube which is attached to a breathing system.

The first case report regarding the use of laryngeal tube (LT) was published in 1999. Since then, many studies have been conducted worldwide to evaluate its use as a new device for emergency airway management both in mannequin and in adult patients. Most of the studies have shown that the LT has a potential role in airway management during anaesthesia or cardiopulmonary resuscitation. Insertion of the LT is generally easy and it provides a good airtight seal. In patients with unstable necks, the head and the neck may be stabilized manually (manual in-line stabilization), but it is not known whether this procedure affects the ease of insertion of the LT. In a patient with an unstable neck, airway management may be required while the patient's occiput is placed directly on the trolley and while the head and neck are stabilized manually (manual in-line stabilization). The manufacturer of the LT claims that, although insertion of the device is best achieved when the neck is flexed and the head extended (Magill position or sniffing position), it can be inserted in any given position of the head. There have been several reports that studied the ease of the insertion of various forms of the LMA. A few studies have concluded that insertion of the LMA classic becomes more difficult when the patient's head and neck are stabilized, but it is often possible to ventilate the lungs through it. However, there has been no study that compares the ease of insertion between the LT and LMA during manual in-line neck stabilization.

Materials and Methods

A randomized single-blinded prospective study was conducted involving a total of 40 ASA I and II (aged from 18-65 years) premedicated patients who were divided into two groups with 20 patients for each group; either LT or LMA group for airway management during elective surgery. Randomization was by use of sealed opaque envelopes containing the letters LT or LMA and with the power of study of 80%. Exclusion criteria included patients at risk of pulmonary aspiration of gastric contents and those with features suggestive of possible difficult intubation (for example Mallampati III-IV classification, a receding chin, protruding front teeth and limited neck extension). After preoxygenation, anaesthesia was induced with intravenous (i.v) fentanyl (Hameln Pharmaceuticals) (1.5 micrograms/kg body weight) and i.v propofol (Astra Zeneca) (2 milligrams/kg body weight). The neuromuscular blockade was produced with either i.v vecuronium (N.V Organon) (0.1 milligrams/kg body weight) or i.v atracurium (Glaxo Smith Kline) (0.5 milligrams/kg body weight). The LT or LMA was inserted after neuromuscular blockade was confirmed using a peripheral nerve stimulator (TOF). A size 3, 4 or 5 LT OR a size 3 or 4 LMA was inserted while the patient's head and neck were being stabilized by an assistant who held the sides of the neck and the mastoid processes (manual in-line stabilization). If it was not possible to ventilate the lungs, or if ETCO2 and/or chest movement did not indicate a patent airway, the LT or LMA was removed. After three failed attempts, the study was terminated and the airway was secured in the most suitable manner determined by the anaesthetist. After successful placement of LT or LMA, anaesthesia was maintained with 66% NO2 in O2 & 2 MAC Sevoflurane. All patients received standard anaesthesia monitoring which included electrocardiography, pulse oximetry, non invasive blood pressure measurement and capnography. Ease of insertion, which include the time required to successfully insert the airway device, episodes of oxygen desaturation (< 95%), abandonment of technique and the number of attempts needed to achieve a patent airway, were recorded. Time of insertion was defined as from the removal of the facemask to successful delivery of the first tidal volume. Results were presented as mean and standard deviation (S.D) or mean and percentile. The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 11.5 for windows was used in statistical analysis. The data from two groups was analyzed using the independent t-test for continuous variables or the Chi square for categorical data. Differences were considered statistically significant when P < 0.05.

Results

Patients' characteristics are shown in Table 1. The two groups were well matched. There was statistically significant difference for both groups in time required
for successful insertion (Table II); time required for LT was 24.8 ± 7.7 seconds and LMA was 36.1± 17.3 seconds (p= 0.01). Both groups had no statistical differences (p>0.05) in number of attempts needed to achieve a patent airway although we were able to achieve a clear airway in all (100%) patients in LT group at the first attempt compared with 85% in LMA group (Table II). The successful insertion rate was 100% for both groups (Table II). Ventilation through the LT and LMA were adequate in all 40 patients (100%) when the patient’s head and neck placed by manual in-line stabilization.

Discussion

There have been several reports that studied the ease of insertion of various forms of the laryngeal mask airways. Asai and colleagues in their study for the ease insertion of LMA classic in 20 patients found that it was always more difficult, and the time taken for insertion was longer; in manual in-line stabilization than in the Magill position; nevertheless, the ventilation was possible in 19 of 20 patients in manual in-line position. Pennant and colleagues reported that the time taken for the insertion of LMA ranged from 22 to 87 seconds with mean time 32 seconds in patients to whom a Philadelphia collar was applied, indicating that insertion was moderately difficult in their study. In contrast to the study done by Brimacombe and colleagues which reported that the LMA was inserted within ten seconds in all 40 patients in the Magill position and 38 of 40 patients during manual in-line stabilization. Therefore, it may be possible to conclude that the insertion of LMA becomes more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Group LT (n=20)</th>
<th>Group LMA (n=20)</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age; years</td>
<td>40.0 (13.9)</td>
<td>37.1 (14.1)</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight; kg</td>
<td>56.5 (8.8)</td>
<td>58.9 (11.7)</td>
<td>0.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height; cm</td>
<td>160.2 (8.2)</td>
<td>160.8 (6.6)</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Group LT (n=20)</th>
<th>Group LMA (n=20)</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time to successful insertion; seconds</td>
<td>24.8 (7.7)</td>
<td>36.1 (17.3)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of attempts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful insertion; yes: no</td>
<td>20:0 (100:0)</td>
<td>20:0 (100:0)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Picture 1: Laryngeal Tube (VBM)

Picture 2: Laryngeal Mask Airway (LMA)
difficult when the patient’s head and neck are stabilized, but is often possible to ventilate the lung through it. In theory, the insertion of LT is more difficult because the curve of the LT is less similar (than the curve of the intubating or Proseal laryngeal mask) to the curve of the oropharynx so that it is more difficult to slide the LT along the oropharyngeal wall. However, this theory is in contrast to our finding where it seems that the insertion of the LT is easier compared with LMA classic during manual in-line stabilization. The result showed there was statistically significant difference for both groups in time required for successful insertion; time required for LT was 24.8 ± 7.7 seconds and LMA was 36.1± 17.3 seconds with p= 0.01. Looking at this result, we conclude that that insertion of the LMA classic becomes more difficult when the patient’s head and neck are stabilized however the time taken for insertion of LT is comparable with the time taken when patient’s head and neck are stabilized in the Magill position.

Although it was more difficult to insert the LMA in manual in-line stabilization but it is often possible to ventilate the lungs through it and this finding is in agreement with previous studies. There was no episode of oxygen desaturation < 95% found in this study and the successful insertion rate was 100% for both groups. Both groups had no statistical differences (p>0.05) in the number of attempts needed to achieve a patent airway although we were able to achieve a clear airway in all (100%) patients in LT group at the first attempt compared with 85% in LMA group. This finding was in agreement with the previous study done by Asai and Dorges, where 100% success rate with one attempt for LT. The reason for the relative difficult for the insertion of LMA classic is possibly due to the fact that the curve of the LMA classic is less similar (than the curve of the intubating laryngeal mask airway and Proseal) to the curve of the oropharyngeal wall when the patient’s head and neck are placed in the neutral position.

Conclusion
We conclude that the LT is easier to insert and is a suitable alternative to the LMA for airway management when the patient’s head and neck are stabilized by manual in-line method.
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