Recent trends in airway management: we are not ready to give up fiberoptic endoscopy [version 1; peer review: 3 approved]

Davide Cattano, Rabail Chaudhry, Rashida Callender, Peter V Killoran, Carin A Hagberg
Department of Anesthesiology, University of Texas Medical School at Houston, Houston, Texas, 77030, USA

First published: 16 May 2014, 3:114
https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.3829.1
Latest published: 16 May 2014, 3:114
https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.3829.1

Abstract
The purpose of this correspondence is to discuss recent findings related to current trends in airway management and to discuss the utilization rates of video laryngoscopes versus traditional techniques in USA, UK, and Canada. To highlight the increased use of video laryngoscopes in difficult airway situations, data on the use of alternative airway devices at our institution collected from 2008 to 2010 are presented alongside the results of previously published surveys collected from 2002 to 2013.
Education and research in anesthesia have increasingly focused on the management of difficult airways, leading to the development of new devices that are gradually becoming available and part of routine use across the globe. It is rather interesting to assess whether we have made much progress in using such devices over the past decade.

We read with great interest the letter “Should we really consider to lay down the Macintosh laryngoscope?” (Karl Storz, Germany), (n=154, usage rate=1.79%, first attempt success rate=94.8%), the Aintree Intubation Catheter (Cook Critical Care, USA), (n=106, usage rate=1.23%, first attempt success rate=96.2%), bougie (n=92, usage rate=1.07%, first attempt success rate=95.7%) and nasal fiberoptic intubation (NFOI), (n=92, usage rate=1.07%, first attempt success rate=85.9%). Among these devices, OFOI and NFOI most likely required multiple intubation attempts, while the other devices had relatively high rates of success on the first intubation attempt.

When comparing our results with those obtained by Ezri et al.2, the most striking difference is the increased use of video laryngoscopes. Ezri et al.2 reported in 2003 that US attending anesthesiologists preferably used flexible fiberoptic endoscopy (75%) for difficult airway management and preferred LMA (81%) in failed intubation/ventilation scenarios. Similarly, in 2004, fiberoptic endoscopy (64%) and some form of blind technique (26%) were used by anesthesiologists in the UK. In 2005, practitioners in Canada preferred fiberoptic endoscopy (34%) and direct laryngoscopy (48%). In most surveys, lack of availability and training with newer equipment was of concern.

### Table 1. Outcomes of surveys completed regarding the preference of alternative airway management devices by geographical area and year completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical area of survey</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Alternative device outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada3</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Fiberoptic (34%) and direct laryngoscopy (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA2</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Fiberoptic (75%) for difficult airway management LMA (81%) in failed intubation/ventilation scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK, Oxford Region3</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Fiberoptic (64%) and blind technique (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada4</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Video laryngoscopy (90%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We analyzed the utilization rates of alternative airway devices using data collected between 2008 and 2010 at our institution, the University of Texas Medical School at Houston, Memorial Hermann Hospital – Texas Medical Center (Table 2).

The most commonly used alternative airway devices were oral fiberoptic intubation (OFOI), (n=318, usage rate=3.69%, first attempt success rate=92.5%), the Glidescope® video laryngoscopy system (Verathon Inc, USA), (n=223, usage rate=2.59%, first attempt success rate=95.5%), the Storz C-MAC® video laryngoscopy system (Karl Storz, Germany), (n=154, usage rate=1.79%, first attempt success rate=96.2%). The device versatility also makes it economical not to mention the greater value of education and training of future anesthesiologists.
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