Accepted Manuscript

Title: Supraglottic Airway Devices during Neonatal Resuscitation: An historical perspective, systematic review and meta-analysis of available clinical trials

Authors: Georg M. Schmölzer, Manish Agarwal, C. Omar F. Kamlin, Peter G. Davis

PII: S0300-9572(12)00886-6
DOI: doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2012.11.002
Reference: RESUS 5405

To appear in: *Resuscitation*

Received date: 11-7-2012
Revised date: 9-10-2012
Accepted date: 4-11-2012

Please cite this article as: Schmölzer GM, Agarwal M, Kamlin COF, Davis PG, Supraglottic Airway Devices during Neonatal Resuscitation: An historical perspective, systematic review and meta-analysis of available clinical trials, *Resuscitation* (2010), doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2012.11.002

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Supraglottic Airway Devices during Neonatal Resuscitation: An historical perspective, systematic review and meta-analysis of available clinical trials

Georg M. Schmölzer MD, PhD^{1,2}, Manish Agarwal³, C. Omar F. Kamlin DrSciMed^{3,4,5}, Peter G. Davis MD^{3,4,5}

¹Department of Pediatrics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada

²Division of Neonatology, Department of Pediatrics, Medical University, Graz, Austria

³Neonatal Services, The Royal Women's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia

⁴Critical Care Stream, Murdoch Children Research Institute, Melbourne, Australia

⁵Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, The University of Melbourne, Australia

Corresponding author:

Georg M. Schmölzer, M.D., Ph.D.

Department of Newborn Medicine,

Royal Alexandra Hospital,

10240 Kingsway Avenue NW,

T5H 3V9, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

Telephone +1 780 735 4670

Fax: +1 780 735 4072

Email: georg.schmoelzer@me.com

ResearcherID: E-7883-2010

No reprints requested

Keywords: INFANTS, NEWBORN, DELIVERY ROOM, NEONATAL RESUSCITATION, ENDOTRACHEAL INTUBATION, SUPRAGLOTTIC AIRWAY DEVICES, LARYNGEAL MASK AIRWAY, OROPHARYNGEAL AIRWAY

Conflict of interest: None

Author's contribution:

Conception and design: GM Schmölzer, M Agarwal, COF Kamlin, PG Davis;

Collection and assembly of data: GM Schmölzer, M Agarwal;

Analysis and interpretation of the data: GM Schmölzer, M Agarwal, COF Kamlin, PG Davis.

Drafting of the article: GM Schmölzer, M Agarwal, COF Kamlin, PG Davis;

Critical revision of the article for important intellectual content: GM Schmölzer, M Agarwal, COF Kamlin, PG Davis;

Final approval of the article: GM Schmölzer, M Agarwal, COF Kamlin, PG Davis.

Authors' affiliations

GMS is supported by a Banting Postdoctoral Fellowship, Canadian Institute of Health Research and an Alberta Innovate – Health Solution Clinical Fellowship. PGD is supported by an Australian National Health and Medical Research Council Practitioner and Principal Research Fellowship, respectively. PGD holds an Australian National Health and Medical Research Council Program Grant No. 384100.

Word count: 3848 words

Abstract: 26w words

50 **Abbreviations:**

51	LM	- Laryngeal mask
52	NICU	- Neonatal intensive care unit
53	RCT	- Randomized control trial
54	CPAP	- Continuous positive airway pressure
55	OR	- Odds ratio
56	CI	- Confidence intervals
57	NNT	- Number needed to treat
58	RR	- Relative Risk

59

60

Abstract

Introduction

Various supraglottic airway devices are routinely used to maintain airway patency in children and adults. However, oropharyngeal airways or laryngeal masks (LM) are not routinely used during neonatal resuscitation.

Method

The aim of this article was to review the available literature about the use of supraglottic airway devices during neonatal resuscitation. We reviewed books, resuscitation manuals and articles from 1830 to the present using the search terms “Infant”, “Newborn”, “Delivery Room”, “Resuscitation”, “Airway management”, “Positive Pressure Respiration”, “Oropharyngeal Airway” and “Laryngeal Mask”.

Results

No study was identified using oropharyngeal airways during neonatal resuscitation. Four trials including 509 infants compared positive pressure ventilation with a LM, bag and mask or an endotracheal tube. Infants in the LM group were intubated less frequently compared to infants in the bag and mask ventilation group 4/275 vs. 28/234 (OR 0.13, 95% CI 0.05-0.34). Infants resuscitated with the LM had significantly less unsuccessful resuscitations 4/275 vs. 31/234 (OR 0.10, 95% CI 0.03-0.28). Two trials including 34 preterm infants compared surfactant administration via LM vs. endotracheal tube. LM surfactant administration was safe and no adverse events were reported.

Conclusion

The efficacy and safety of oropharyngeal airways during neonatal resuscitation remain unclear and randomized trials are required. The current evidence suggests that resuscitation with a LM is a feasible and safe alternative to mask ventilation in infants >34 weeks gestation and birth weight >2000g. However, further randomized control trials are needed to evaluate short- and long-term outcomes following use of laryngeal masks. In addition, surfactant administration via LM should be used only within clinical trials.

Introduction

Approximately 10% of newborn infants require some form of respiratory support in first minutes after birth¹. The International Liaison Committee On Resuscitation (ILCOR) and various national guidelines recommend techniques and equipment for neonatal resuscitation²⁻⁵. They all agree that mask ventilation is the cornerstone of respiratory support immediately after birth²⁻⁵. However, several factors can reduce the effectiveness of mask ventilation, including poor face mask technique resulting in leak or airway obstruction, spontaneous movements of the baby, movements by or distraction of the resuscitator, and procedures such as changing the wraps or fitting a hat⁶⁻⁸. Delivery room studies have shown that mask ventilation is difficult and mask leak and airway obstruction are common^{6,7,9,10}. Various airway maneuvers (e.g. neutral position, chin lift or jaw thrust) have been recommended to optimize mask ventilation and reduce airway obstruction⁸. Resuscitation guidelines suggest that 'in floppy babies application of jaw thrust or the use of an appropriately sized oropharyngeal airway, which may be helpful in opening the airway'⁴. Although oropharyngeal airways are frequently used for airway patency in children and adults¹¹⁻¹³, none are routinely used during neonatal resuscitation.

Archie Brain, a British anesthetist, described the laryngeal mask (LM) as an alternative to endotracheal intubation in 1981¹⁴. The LM consists of an airway tube connected distally to a soft elliptical mask with an inflatable rim to fit over the laryngeal inlet whereas the proximal end connects to the positive pressure ventilation device¹⁴. A LM provides an alternative in difficult airway scenario where either mask ventilation is ineffective or intubation impossible¹⁵. Currently LMs are routinely used by paramedics, emergency rooms and operating theaters for adult and pediatric anesthesia^{12,16,17}. In newborn infants, the evidence is mainly derived from case series and observational studies^{18,19}, suggesting that a LM can provide an effective rescue airway during resuscitation if both mask ventilation and endotracheal intubation have been unsuccessful. Current neonatal resuscitation guidelines recommend use of LM in newborn infants > 34 weeks gestation or > 2000 gram birth weight when face mask ventilation or tracheal intubation is unsuccessful or not feasible^{2,4}. In addition, use of LMs have been reported during neonatal transport²⁰⁻²², provision of prolonged mechanical ventilation in particular for infants with upper airway abnormalities²³⁻²⁷, and administration of intratracheal medications²⁸⁻³². Although, LMs are recommended

by various neonatal resuscitation guidelines²⁻⁴, if mask ventilation or endotracheal intubation have been unsuccessful, they are not routinely used during neonatal resuscitation.

The aim of this article was to review the available literature on the use of oropharyngeal airways and laryngeal mask airway during neonatal resuscitation.

Methods

Search strategy for historical perspective and systematic review of available literature

We reviewed books, resuscitation manuals and articles from 1830 to the present with the search terms “Infant”, “Newborn”, “Delivery Room”, “Resuscitation”, “Airway management”, “Positive Pressure Respiration”, “Oropharyngeal Airway” and “Laryngeal Mask”. We used the standard methods of the Cochrane Neonatal Review Group for inclusion, review, and quantitative methods.

Data sources and search strategy for meta-analysis

We searched Medline (1980 - May 2012) and Embase (1980 - May 2012) using the following MeSH database search terms: “Infant”, “Newborn”, “Airway Management”, “Resuscitation”, “Positive Pressure Respiration” and “Oropharyngeal airways” “Laryngeal Mask”. The search was limited to human RCTs with no language restrictions (Table 2). We also searched clinicaltrials.gov for completed (Table 3) and ongoing trials (Table 4) using similar search terms, reviewed abstracts from the Pediatric Academic Society annual meetings (2000–2010), and performed a manual search of references in narrative and systematic reviews on laryngeal masks. The full search strategies for PubMed and EMBASE are detailed in Appendix 1.

Study selection

Two authors (GMS, COFK) independently screened titles and abstracts for potential eligibility and full texts to confirm eligibility (Table 2). When discrepancies arose, a third party was consulted. Data were extracted using a standardized data collection form to record study design and methodological characteristics, patient characteristics, interventions, outcomes, and missing outcome data (Table 3).

Data synthesis and analysis

The analyses were performed using Review Manager 5.0. Dichotomous data were expressed as odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). For all analyses, we used a fixed-effect model. The number needed to treat (NNT) was derived from the Relative Risk (RR) in meta-analyses where the 95% CI (or the RR) did not include zero. Heterogeneity was explored using a chi-square test, and the quantity of heterogeneity was measured using the I^2 statistic.

Results

No published RCT investigating oropharyngeal airways was identified. However, one trial is currently evaluating the use of an oropharyngeal airway in preterm infants receiving mask ventilation³³ (Table 4). Four RCTs comparing LM vs. mask ventilation or endotracheal intubation were found. Several RCTs investigating surfactant administration via LM have been identified³⁴⁻³⁷ (Table 4).

Oropharyngeal airways

Sir Fredrick Hewitt recognized that upper airway obstruction was a common problem during general anesthesia³⁸. In 1907 he presented the first known artificial oral 'air-way' (Table 1)³⁸⁻⁴⁰. Following Hewitt, Lombard⁴¹ and Waters⁴² also developed oropharyngeal airways (Table 1). In 1933 Arthur Guedel presented a black rubber modification of the metal Water's airway "the Guedel Oropharyngeal airway" (Figure 1)⁴³. The Guedel airway was designed to hold the tongue away from the back of the pharynx, thus providing a clear channel for respired gases⁴⁴. Oropharyngeal airways may be used to open the airway in floppy newborn infants, or if mask ventilation is ineffective^{4,45-48}. In addition, various surveys evaluating neonatal resuscitation practice reported that Guedel airways are part of the neonatal resuscitation equipment^{5,49}. Guedel airways for preterm and term infants come in traditional sizes of 000, 00, and 0 (Figure 1). However, several studies compared the design of available Guedel airways and reported obvious shape and length differences, despite being labeled the same size⁵⁰⁻⁵². The use of oropharyngeal airways during neonatal resuscitation has not been systematically studied. No study addressing the use of an oropharyngeal airway during neonatal resuscitation was identified. Currently, one RCT is

comparing an oropharyngeal airway for prevention of airway obstruction during positive pressure ventilation in preterm infants < 34 weeks gestation during neonatal resuscitation³³.

Laryngeal Mask airway

Available Laryngeal Airway Masks

In 2004, Trevisanuto et al. reported that although 35% of Italian anesthesiologists and 23% of pediatricians have experience with LMs⁵³ for airway management in newborn infants. Anesthesiologists were more enthusiastic about the LM than pediatricians. The education level, competence and utilization rates of LM during neonatal resuscitation was similar in both groups⁵³. Gandini et al. assessed the knowledge about LMs in 80 health care providers in Australia and reported similar results⁵⁴. Thirty-one percent had not heard of the LM, 57% did not know the LM could be used for neonatal resuscitation and 88% thought it was a disposable device⁵⁴. Laryngeal mask size and infants birth weight are the main limitation for LM use in newborn infants. A size 1 LM is recommended for all infants < 5 kg. Observational and randomized studies have demonstrated that a size 1 LM can be used in term and preterm infants >34 weeks or > 2000g. However, currently data for the use of LMs for preterm infants are lacking although, successful resuscitation of premature infants with birth weights as low as 800 g have been reported^{55,56}.

Currently, there are various LMs available e.g. i) LMA ClassicTM, LMA ProSealTM and LMA SupremeTM (LMA North America Inc., San Diego, CA, USA), ii) i-gelTM supraglottic airway (Intersurgical, Liverpool, NY, USA) or iii) Air-QTM Disposable Laryngeal Mask Airway (Mercury Medical, Clearwater, FL, USA).

The LMA SupremeTM, i-gelTM and Air-QTM are disposable single use LMs compared to reusable and therefore more expensive LMA ClassicTM, LMA ProSealTM. The i-gelTM supraglottic airway has a non-inflating soft-gel cuff compared to inflatable cuffs with all other LMs. A non-inflating soft-gel cuff potentially might reduce reported soft tissue trauma⁵⁷⁻⁵⁹. There is the potential for gastric distension, although this has never been reported in newborn infants^{12,25,60-62}. The LMA ProSealTM and LMA SupremeTM have a gastric vent for air removal from the stomach in cases where gastric distension compromised positive pressure ventilation. Although, various studies compare laryngeal masks from LMA North America Inc., randomized control trials comparing the performance of each LM are warranted.

Mannequin studies

The skills needed to successfully insert any LM (Figure 3) can be acquired using neonatal mannequins^{54,55,63,64}. After a 15 minute educational session using a mannequin Gandini et al. found that the mean time to successfully insert a LM was five seconds⁵⁴. Micaglio et al.⁶³ compared time from insertion to the first inflation of an artificial lung for the LMA ClassicTM and the LMA ProSealTM. The success rates of the first attempt were significantly higher with the LMA ProSealTM compared to the LMA ClassicTM (97% vs. 92%)⁶³. However, there was no difference in the mean insertion time, 10 seconds for the LMA ClassicTM and 11 seconds for the LMA ProSealTM. Trevisanuto et al. compared LMA SupremeTM, ClassicTM, and ProSealTM in a mannequin study to assess time to establish adequate ventilation, and ease of insertion⁵⁵. The success rate to insert a LM with the first attempt was comparable among the three devices. The mean time to establish effective ventilation was significantly lower with the Supreme LMATM (12 seconds) compared to the LMA ProSealTM (19 seconds), however it was similar compared to the LMA ClassicTM (15 seconds)⁵⁵. Micaglio et al. compared delivered peak inflation pressures between the classic and LMA ProSealTM⁶⁴. Both LMs delivered similar pressures with a set peak inflation pressure of 10-20 cm H₂O⁶⁴. However, the LMA ClassicTM was unable to deliver peak pressures higher than 24 cm H₂O even though the set pressures were 30, 35 or 40cm H₂O⁶⁴. The LMA ProSealTM was able to deliver all of the set pressures⁶⁴. This study suggested that the LMA ProSealTM provides a better laryngeal seal during positive pressure ventilation. However, the study was performed in a mannequin, which has distinctive differences compared to newborn infants⁶⁵. Proficiency in endotracheal intubation cannot be achieved with mannequin practice alone⁶⁶⁻⁶⁹. However, mannequin studies suggest that proficiency in LM insertion techniques can be achieved with a 15-minute educational session^{54,55,63,64}. Clinical trials are urgently needed as this device has the potential to change resuscitation practices around the world and may lead to LMs becoming the primary resuscitation device in near term and term infants.

Laryngeal mask during neonatal resuscitation

Observational studies

Laryngeal masks have been recommended as rescue airway if mask ventilation or endotracheal intubation is unsuccessful or not feasible⁴. The available evidence in newborn

infants comes from case series, cohort studies and four RCTs (Table 2). Paterson et al. reported the first prospective study evaluating LM for newborn infants ≥ 2.5 kg and gestation ≥ 35 weeks⁷⁰. They demonstrated that the LM could be successfully inserted with first attempt on all 21 newborn infants⁷⁰ and 20 of these infants were successfully resuscitated without any complications⁷⁰. Trevisanuto et al. compared 95 newborn infants > 34 weeks gestation receiving respiratory support via LM with a historical control group⁷¹. 94/95 newborn infants were successfully resuscitated using LM. The need for tracheal intubation was almost halved using LM (67% to 34%)⁷¹. Gandini et al. retrospectively analyzed LM use in 104 newborn infants requiring positive pressure ventilation during neonatal resuscitation⁷². They reported that the LM was successfully inserted in first attempt in all 104 newborn infants and 103/104 newborn infants were successfully resuscitated⁷². Zanardo et al. reported that resuscitation of late preterm infants (34-37 weeks gestation) using a LM was associated with lower NICU admissions rates and shorter length of stay compared to mask-ventilation or endotracheal intubation⁷³. In addition, newborn infants resuscitated with LM had higher Apgar scores, required less respiratory support and NICU admission compared to newborn infants receiving endotracheal intubation⁶².

Meta-analysis of randomized trials

We identified four RCTs (Table 2) which included a total of 534 infants comparing LM with endotracheal tube or facemask ventilation^{58,61,74,75}. Two RCTs compared LM versus mask ventilation. Singh et al. randomized 50 infants > 35 weeks gestation to either LM or mask ventilation in the delivery room⁷⁴. Both devices had similar success rates, rates of endotracheal intubation, and Apgar scores⁷⁴. Zhu et al. randomized 369 newborn infants (>34 weeks or >2000 grams) to receive respiratory support either with LM or bag and mask immediately after birth⁶¹. Laryngeal masks were successfully inserted with the first attempt in 98.5% with a mean (SD) insertion time of 7.8 (2.2) seconds. LM group had significant higher successful resuscitation rates, less endotracheal intubations, and shorter total ventilation times. Esmail et al. compared LM versus endotracheal intubation during neonatal resuscitation in 40 newborn infants⁵⁸. No significant differences between insertion time, failure rate with 1st attempt, resuscitation outcomes or traumatic airway events were reported⁵⁸. Feroze et al. compared LM versus endotracheal tube or facemask ventilation in

75 infants >1500g birth weight⁷⁵ and reported no difference in insertion time. However, the time for effective resuscitation was doubled in the bag and mask group compared to the LM group⁷⁵. Three RCTs reported the number of intubations when either LM or bag and mask ventilation failed to provide adequate ventilation. Fewer infants in the LM group required intubation compared to the mask ventilation group 4/275 vs. 28/234 (OR 0.13, 95% CI 0.05-0.34, NNT 10 to prevent one intubation) (Figure 2). Two RCTs (Figure 2) contributed a small number of infants and the majority of data come from the RCT by Zhu et al. Therefore, these results should be interpreted with caution. The operators in three trials were anesthetists which are more likely familiar with LM insertion^{58,74,75}. Feroze et al. reported a very short intubation time of only 9 seconds⁷⁵. The study by Zhu et al. was quasi-randomized and their publication did not provide a CONSORT-chart, a consent process or blinding⁶¹. All infants in Zhu et al. study were resuscitated with 100% oxygen⁶¹. In addition, 26 infants in the mask group were intubated after only 66 sec of mask ventilation, which potentially was rushed⁶¹. Overall, RCTs have shown that initial respiratory support with a LM is feasible and safe. However, there is not enough evidence to recommend LM instead of mask ventilation for initial respiratory support in the delivery room and large randomized trials are warranted before the technique is widely applied.

Surfactant administration

Available evidence comes from 17 newborn infants described in case reports and 34 infants included in RCTs^{28,30,76-78}. Brimacombe et al. described surfactant administration via LM in one term and one preterm infant of 30 weeks gestation^{30,76}. Both infants showed improvement after surfactant administration. Brimacombe et al. suctioned the nasogastric tube which yielded 1.7 ml of surfactant suggesting that 3.3 ml had entered the lungs^{28,30}. Trevisanuto et al. reported the feasibility and practicality of administering surfactant via LMA in 12 preterm infants with a median gestational age of 31 weeks^{19,76}. In eight preterm infants, a significant increase in the mean arterial to alveolar oxygen tension ratio was observed. However, in four no improvement was observed, suggesting a large portion of surfactant did not reach the lungs of these infants. Micaglio et al. used a nasogastric tube to administer surfactant in three preterm infants^{28,31,32}. Two RCTs reported surfactant administration via a LM^{77,78}. Stewart et al. compared surfactant administration via LM (n=8) vs. continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) + oxygen and no surfactant (n=5) in preterm

infants >1200g birth weight within 72 hours of age⁷⁷. Infants who received surfactant via a LM had lower oxygen requirements. However, the trial was terminated due to low enrolment (Table 3)³⁴. Santana-Rivas et al. compared surfactant administration via endotracheal intubation (n=10) vs. LM (n=9) in preterm infants between 29 and 37 weeks⁷⁸. After surfactant administration infants were returned to nasal CPAP if possible⁷⁸. Failure of nasal CPAP after surfactant administration was 90% in the intubation groups compared to 22% in the LM group (p=0.003)⁷⁸. Neither RCT reported any adverse events during surfactant administration via a LM. In comparison, surfactant administration via an endotracheal tube has been associated with a series of adverse events^{32,79-83}. Although, pilot data are promising, the current available evidence suggests that surfactant administration via laryngeal mask should be limited to clinical trials (Table 3).

Epinephrine administration

There is little evidence evaluating the safety and efficacy of administering epinephrine to newborn infants through a LM. Epinephrine administration, via LM, has been studied in animal models and during adult cardio-pulmonary resuscitation^{31,32}. Chen et al. compared administration of epinephrine via intravenous, endotracheal, injection in the upper end of the LM and via a catheter through the LM, in a non-arrest adult porcine model³². No difference in peak plasma epinephrine levels, mean arterial blood pressure and heart rate were found between endotracheal and injection via a catheter through the LM^{31,32}. Although the lowest peak plasma epinephrine level was reported when epinephrine was injected in the upper end of the LM³², mean arterial blood pressure and heart rate were similar to endotracheal epinephrine administration^{32,56}. Liao et al. randomized 30 piglets to receive different epinephrine doses through either endotracheal tube or LM via a catheter³¹. Piglets in the endotracheal tube group received 50-microgram/kg epinephrine and piglets in the LM groups were divided to receive either two, four or six-fold dose of epinephrine compared to the endotracheal tube dose³¹. After epinephrine administration, piglets in the endotracheal tube group and the six fold LM group had elevated arterial pressures one min after administration³¹. Piglets in the two and four fold group did not show any increase in hemodynamic parameters³¹. This may suggest need for higher dose via LM. One case report described an immediate response of an 800g newborn infant to the

administration of epinephrine through a laryngeal mask⁵⁶. The current available evidence does not allow any recommendations for epinephrine administration.

Neonatal transport

Five cases of LM use during neonatal transport have been reported^{20-22,27,84}. Fraser et al. reported inter-hospital transfer of two infants with type 3 laryngotracheo-oesophageal clefts²². Trevisanuto et al. described two infants with congenital airway malformations during inter-hospital transport^{20,26}. Brimacombe et al. described a newborn infant with sudden apneic episodes during helicopter transport²¹. The median (IQR) gestational age and birth weight of these five infants was 36 (35-40) weeks and 2800 (2610-2900) grams, respectively. All five infants required rescue airway management with LM as both bag and mask ventilation or endotracheal intubation either failed or were not feasible^{20-22,27,84}. All infants were successfully managed with a size 1 LM and none received any sedatives or anesthetic drugs prior to LM insertion^{20-22,27,84}. These five cases demonstrate the potential use of LM during neonatal transport. In particular during air transport endotracheal intubation is almost impossible due to vibrations, limited space and access to the infants head; hence neonatal air transport services might consider LM as part of their equipment. However, RCTs are needed to compare endotracheal intubation versus LM during neonatal transports.

Long-term mechanical ventilation

Laryngeal masks have been primarily used for short-term airway support in newborns. Their safety during long-term ventilatory support has not been established. Several case reports have described LM to provide mechanical ventilation up to 6 days without apparent complications^{23-25,27,61,85-88}. In addition, Fraser et al. reported one case of Type 3 laryngotracheo-esophageal cleft in a 35 weeks preterm infant who received high frequency oscillation over 10 hours via a laryngeal mask airway suffering from acute respiratory failure^{26,61}. Although, these case reports demonstrate that a LM can be used for long-term ventilation, a small animal model of prolonged LM use raises significant concerns⁸⁴. Ferrets ventilated with a laryngeal mask developed significant lingual edema and cyanosis after 6 to 16 hours resulting in airway obstruction⁸⁴. Histologic examination showed venous and capillary congestion. The investigators found that it was difficult to suction the airway

effectively through the LM, and tenacious secretions contributed to respiratory compromise⁸⁴. Although, case reports have demonstrated that LMs can be used for prolonged ventilation, randomized studies are required to determine long-term effects of laryngeal mask placement.

“Can't ventilate, can't intubate” situation

Although several delivery room studies reported complication with mask ventilation and endotracheal intubation^{7,9,10,67-69,89}, the incidence of “can't intubate, can't ventilate” situation has not been reported in newborn infants. In comparison it has been estimated 0.01-2 per 10,000 adult cases⁹⁰. However, the majority of newborn infants can adequately ventilated and oxygenated using a mask when found unexpectedly difficult to intubate⁷. Brimacombe et al. reported a “can't intubate, can't ventilate scenario” in an 800g preterm infant in a rural hospital where mask ventilation and intubation was impossible⁵⁶. Intubation failed to achieve increase in heart rate and adequate ventilation was only possible with a size 1 LM without inflating the cuff⁵⁶. Fortunately, this is a very rare scenario in the daily neonatal practice. However, neonatologists should be aware of the potential of a “can't intubate, can't ventilate” situation and be familiar with alternative techniques to achieve a patent airway (e.g. laryngeal mask placement, airway manoeuvres⁸, bronchoscopic intubation⁹¹, or video-laryngoscope⁹²).

Safety of Laryngeal mask airways

A survey of almost 12 000 patients ranging from infant to adults reported critical incidents related to LM management in only 18 (0.15%) cases^{70,93,94}. Complications have also been described during and after the use of LM in infants and older children^{70,95-97}. Bronchoscopic studies have noted that the mask is often improperly seated and partially obstructs the laryngeal opening^{27,28,30,70,76}. Few complications have been reported in newborn infants include vomiting^{58,61}, regurgitation^{58,61}, soft tissue trauma⁵⁷⁻⁵⁹, laryngospasm, breath holding^{12,21,25,61,62}, vomiting, stridor, and desaturation after LM removal. However, no episodes of airway trauma, obstruction, or laryngospasm were reported in the neonatal case series and retrospective cohorts of Paterson, Gandini, Trevisanuto, and Zanardo^{62,70-72,94}. LM can be correctly positioned with the 1st attempt^{70,94,94} and insertion techniques are quickly learnt by unskilled operators^{70,94,96,97}. Case series reported that LM insertion is less

invasive and faster compared to endotracheal intubation^{28,30,70,76,98}. Esmail et al. found a higher 1st attempt failure rate in the LM group compared with those managed with an endotracheal tube⁹⁹. However, the operators in this RCT were anaesthesiologists who had a much higher intubation success rate. These findings contrasted with those of Zhu et al. who found better 1st attempt success with LM when used by paediatricians⁶¹. Disadvantages of LMs include: i) time to start ventilation compared to bag and mask ventilation^{57,59,60}, ii) potential of gastric distension and gastric aspiration, although never reported in newborn infants^{12,25,60-62}, iii) laryngospasm^{38,94}, iv) development of complete or partial airway obstruction^{41,94}, v) perfect positioning of LM was observed in only 44% of all cases^{40,94}, vi) soft tissue injury in the uvula, oropharynx, epiglottis^{98,100}, impossibility to suction airway^{42,84,101}.

Gaps in the knowledge

No study has investigated the additional use of a Guedel airway during mask ventilation to reduce airway obstruction or mask leak. It is possible that lifting the tongue as expected action of a Guedel airway might reduce airway obstruction during mask ventilation.

Although there is increasing evidence that a LM has a role in neonatal airway management, further RCTs are needed. Of particular interest are long-term outcomes as cohort studies reported shorter duration of ventilatory support for infants admitted to the NICU. Randomized studies comparing i) available LMs versus bag and mask or endotracheal ventilation, ii) surfactant and epinephrine administration via LM versus endotracheal tube or nasogastric tube, iii) chest compression, during LM vs. bag and mask or endotracheal tube ventilation is required. In addition, studies addressing the potential use of LM in very small preterm infants and their effect on long-term outcomes are warranted. Furthermore, studies addressing the most efficient insertion technique to teach all medical professionals involved in neonatal resuscitation are necessary.

Conclusion

Efficacy and safety of oropharyngeal airways during neonatal resuscitation remain unclear and randomized trials are needed. The current evidence suggests that resuscitation with a LM is a feasible and safe alternative to mask ventilation in infants >34 weeks gestation and

442 birth weight >2000g. However further randomized control trials are needed to demonstrate
443 clinical short- and long-term benefits of laryngeal masks.

444

Accepted Manuscript

Appendix #1: Search strategies for meta-analysis (online supplement)

Search strategy for PubMed: last performed on 02/07/2012

Limits activated: "Publication date from 1980/01/01 to 2012/05/12", "Humans", "Clinical Trial", "Infant: birth-23 months"

- #1 MeSH descriptor Infant explode all trees (Result: 36,866)
- #2 MeSH descriptor Newborn explode all trees (Result: 17,541)
- #3 MeSH descriptor Airway management explode all trees (Result: 1,504)
- #4 MeSH descriptor Resuscitation explode all trees (Result: 1,074)
- #5 MeSH descriptor Positive Pressure Respiration explode all trees (Result: 378)
- #6 MeSH descriptor Laryngeal Mask explode all trees (Result: 116)
- #7 ((#1) AND #2) AND #3 (Result: 1,103)
- #8 (#7) AND #4 (Results: 689)
- #9 (#7) AND #5 (Results: 304)
- #10 (#7) AND #6 (Results: 20)
- #11 (#7) AND #4) AND #6 (Results: 7)

Search Strategy for Embase: last performed on 02/07/2012

Limits activated: "Human", "1980 -Current", and "infant <to one year>"

- #1 Infant (Result: 91,122)
- #2 Newborn (Result: 91,122)
- #3 Airway management (Result: 133)
- #4 Resuscitation (Result: 739)
- #5 Positive Pressure Respiration (Result: 353)
- #6 Laryngeal Mask (Result: 139)
- #7 ((#1) AND #2) AND #3 (Result: 133)
- #8 (#7) AND #4 (Results: 17)
- #9 (#7) AND #5 (Results: 7)
- #10 (#7) AND #6 (Results: 32)
- #11 (#7) AND #4) AND #6 (Results: 7)

References

1. Singhal N, McMillan DD, Yee WH, Akiernan AR, Yee YJ. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the standardized neonatal resuscitation program. *J Perinatol.* 2001;21:388–92.
2. Kattwinkel J, Perlman JM, Aziz K, Colby C, Fairchild K, Gallagher J, et al. Part 15: Neonatal Resuscitation: 2010 American Heart Association Guidelines for Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care. *Circulation.* 2010;122:S909–19.
3. Schmölzer GM, Resch B, Schwindt JC. Standards zur Versorgung von reifen Neugeborenen in Österreich. *Monatsschr Kinderheilkd.* 2011;159:1235–43.
4. Richmond S, Wyllie J. European Resuscitation Council Guidelines for Resuscitation 2010. *Resuscitation.* 2010;81:1389–99.
5. Schmölzer GM, Olischar M, Raith W, Resch B, Reiterer F, Müller W, et al. Erstversorgung von Neugeborenen. *Monatsschr Kinderheilkd.* 2010;158:471–6.
6. Finer NN, Rich W, Wang C, Leone T. Airway Obstruction During Mask Ventilation of Very Low Birth Weight Infants During Neonatal Resuscitation. *Pediatrics;*123:865–9.
7. Schmölzer GM, Dawson JA, Kamlin COF, O'Donnell CPF, Morley CJ, Davis PG. Airway obstruction and gas leak during mask ventilation of preterm infants in the delivery room. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed.* 2011;96:F254–7.
8. Chua C, Schmölzer GM, Davis PG. Airway manoeuvres to achieve upper airway patency during mask ventilation in newborn infants – An historical perspective. *Resuscitation.* 2012;83:411–6.
9. Schmölzer GM, Kamlin COF, O'Donnell CPF, Dawson JA, Morley CJ, Davis PG. Assessment of tidal volume and gas leak during mask ventilation of preterm infants in the delivery room. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed.* 2010;95:F393–7.
10. Poulton DA, Schmölzer GM, Morley CJ, Davis PG. Assessment of chest rise during mask ventilation of preterm infants in the delivery room. *Resuscitation.* 2011;82:175–9.
11. Ramesh S, Jayanthi R. Supraglottic airway devices in children. *Indian J Anaesth.* 2011;55:476–82.
12. Taylor S, Berry A. The roles of the laryngeal mask airway in emergency medicine. *Em Med.* 1998;10:141–50.
13. Baskett TF. Arthur Guedel and the oropharyngeal airway. *Resuscitation.* 2004;63:3–5.
14. Brain AI. The laryngeal mask--a new concept in airway management. *Br J Anaesth.* 1983;55:801–5.

- 512 15. Brain AI. The laryngeal mask airway--a possible new solution to airway problems in
513 the emergency situation. *Arch Emerg Med.* 1984;1:229–32.
- 514 16. Caplan RA, Benumof JL, Berry FA, Blitt CD, Bode RH, Cheney FW, et al. Practice
515 guidelines for management of the difficult airway. *Anesthesiology.* 1993;78:597–
516 602.
- 517 17. Joshi GP, Inagaki Y, White PF, Taylor-Kennedy L, Wat LI, Gevirtz C, et al. Use of the
518 laryngeal mask airway as an alternative to the tracheal tube during ambulatory
519 anesthesia. *Anaesth Analg.* 1997;85:573–7.
- 520 18. Grein A, Weiner G. Laryngeal mask airway versus bag-mask ventilation or
521 endotracheal intubation for neonatal resuscitation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.*
522 2009;18;(2):CD003314
- 523 19. Abdel-Latif ME, Osborn DA. Laryngeal mask airway surfactant administration for
524 prevention of morbidity and mortality in preterm infants with or at risk of
525 respiratory distress syndrome. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2011.6;(7):CD008309
- 526 20. Trevisanuto D. Laryngeal Mask Airway for the Interhospital Transport of Neonates.
527 *Pediatrics.* 2005 115:e109-11
- 528 21. Brimacombe JR, De Maio B. Emergency use of the laryngeal mask airway during
529 helicopter transfer of a neonate. *J Clin Anesth.* 1995;7:689–90.
- 530 22. Fraser J, Hill C, McDonald D, Jones C, Petros A. The use of the laryngeal mask airway
531 for inter-hospital transport of infants with type 3 laryngotracheo-oesophageal
532 clefts. *Intensive Care Med;* 1999;25:714–6.
- 533 23. Gandini D, Brimacombe J. Laryngeal mask airway for ventilatory support over a 4-
534 day period in a neonate with Pierre Robin sequence. *Paediatr Anaesth.*
535 2003;13:181–2.
- 536 24. Bucx MJL, Grolman W, Kruisinga FH, Lindeboom JAH, Van Kempen. The prolonged
537 use of the laryngeal mask airway in a neonate with airway obstruction and Treacher
538 Collins syndrome. *Paediatr Anaesth.* 2003;13:530–3.
- 539 25. Fernández-Jurado MI, Fernández-Baena M. Use of laryngeal mask airway for
540 prolonged ventilatory support in a preterm newborn. *Paediatr Anaesth.*
541 2002;12:369–70.
- 542 26. Fraser J, Petros A. High-frequency oscillation via a laryngeal mask airway.
543 *Anaesthesia.* 1999;54:404.
- 544 27. Udaeta ME, Weiner GM. Alternative Ventilation Strategies: Laryngeal Masks. *Clin*
545 *Perinatol.* 2006;33:99–110.
- 546 28. Micaglio M, Zanardo V, Ori C, Parotto M, Doglioni N, Trevisanuto D. ProSeal LMA for
547 surfactant administration. *Paediatr Anaesth.* 2007;18:91–2.

- 548 29. Trevisanuto D, Grazzina N, Ferrarese P, Micaglio M, Verghese C, Zanardo V.
549 Laryngeal Mask Airway Used as a Delivery Conduit for the Administration of
550 Surfactant to Preterm Infants with Respiratory Distress Syndrome. *Biol Neonate*.
551 2005;87:217–20.
- 552 30. Brimacombe J, Gandini D, Keller C. The laryngeal mask airway for administration of
553 surfactant in two neonates with respiratory distress syndrome. *Paediatr Anaesth*.
554 2004;14:188–90.
- 555 31. Liao CK, Lin HJ, Foo NP, Lin CC, GUO H, Chen KT. Epinephrine administration via a
556 laryngeal mask airway: what is the optimal dose? *Signa Vitae*. 2010;5:25–8.
- 557 32. Chen K-T, Lin H-J, Guo H-R, Lin M-T, Lin C-C. Feasibility study of epinephrine
558 administration via laryngeal mask airway using a porcine model. *Resuscitation*.
559 2006;69:503–7.
- 560 33. Kamlin C. Oropharyngeal airway for prevention of airway obstruction during
561 positive pressure ventilation in preterm infants < 34 weeks gestation during
562 neonatal resuscitation, http://www.anzctr.org.au/trial_view.aspx?ID=343149
- 563 34. Kattwinkel J. Randomized Controlled Trial of Surfactant Administration by Laryngeal
564 Mask Airway (LMA). clinicaltrials.gov.
- 565 35. Pinheiro JMB. Randomized Controlled Trial of Surfactant Delivery Via Laryngeal
566 Mask Airway (LMA) Versus Endotracheal Intubation. clinicaltrials.gov.
- 567 36. Roberts KD. Laryngeal Mask Airway (LMA) for Surfactant Administration in
568 Neonates. clinicaltrials.gov.
- 569 37. Silva YP. Efficacy Evaluation of Surfactant Administration Via Laryngeal Mask Airway.
570 clinicaltrials.gov.
- 571 38. Hewitt F. An artificial “airway” for use during anaesthetisation. *Lancet*; 1908. 490–
572 1.
- 573 39. Edwards G. Frederick William Hewitt (1857-1916): First Frederic Hewitt Lecture
574 delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons of England on 1st November, 1950.
575 *Annals of The Royal College of Surgeons of England*. 1951;8:233.
- 576 40. Haridas RP. The Hewitt airway - the first known artificial oral “air-way” 101 years
577 since its description. *Anaesthesia*. 2009;64:435–8.
- 578 41. Lumbard JE. A Controller of the Tongue and Palate During General Anesthesia.
579 *JAMA*. 1915;64:1757.
- 580 42. Gillespie NA. Ralph Milton Waters: a brief biography. *Br J Anaesth*. 1949;21:197–
581 214.
- 582 43. Guedel AE. A nontraumatic pharyngeal airway. *JAMA*. 1933;100:1862.

- 583 44. Marsh AM, Nunn JF, Taylor SJ, Charlesworth CH. Airway obstruction associated with
584 the use of the Guedel airway. *Br J Anaesth.* 1991;67:517–23.
- 585 45. Oulton J. Evaluation of methods of resuscitation. *Canadian Journal of Anesthesia*
586 1955.
- 587 46. Donald I. Resuscitation of the Newborn. *Postgrad. Med.* 1953;29:247–53.
- 588 47. Vasey P. Asphyxia Neonatorum. *J Coll Gen Pract.* 1963;6:373.
- 589 48. Apgar V. Infant resuscitation. *Postgrad. Med.* 1956;19:447–50.
- 590 49. O'Donnell CPF, Davis PG, Morley CJ. Use of supplementary equipment for
591 resuscitation of newborn infants at tertiary perinatal centres in Australia and New
592 Zealand. *Acta Paediatr.* 2005;94:1261–5.
- 593 50. Davies JA, Maguire AM. Variability in Guedel airway design. *Anaesthesia.*
594 2006;61:297–8.
- 595 51. Bould MD, Thomas ML, Stylianou M. Variability of Guedel-type airways.
596 *Anaesthesia.* 2006;61:1125–6.
- 597 52. Moore S, Glaisyer H. Unusually shaped Guedel airways. *Anaesthesia.* 2005;60:723–
598 4.
- 599 53. Trevisanuto D, Ferrarese P, Zanardo V, Chiandetti L. Laryngeal mask airway in
600 neonatal resuscitation: a survey of current practice and perceived role by
601 anaesthesiologists and paediatricians. *Resuscitation.* 2004;60:291–6.
- 602 54. Gandini D, Brimacombe J. Manikin training for neonatal resuscitation with the
603 laryngeal mask airway. *Paediatr Anaesth.* 2004;14:493–4.
- 604 55. Trevisanuto D, Parotto M, Doglioni N, Ori C, Zanardo V, Micaglio M. The Supreme
605 Laryngeal Mask Airway™ (LMA): A new neonatal supraglottic device: Comparison
606 with Classic and ProSeal LMA in a manikin. *Resuscitation.* 2012;83:97–100.
- 607 56. Brimacombe J, Gandini D. Airway rescue and drug delivery in an 800 g neonate with
608 the laryngeal mask airway. *Paediatr Anaesth.* 1999;9:178.
- 609 57. Paterson SJ, Byrne PJ. Time required to insert laryngeal mask airway in neonates
610 requiring resuscitation. *Anesthesiology.* 1995;82:318.
- 611 58. Esmail N, Saleh M, Ali A. Laryngeal mask airway versus endotracheal intubation for
612 Apgar score improvement in neonatal resuscitation. *Egypt J Anesthesiol.*
613 2002;18:115–21.
- 614 59. Robotham J. Neonatal resuscitation using the laryngeal mask airway.
615 *Anesthesiology.* 1994;80:27A.
- 616 60. A K. Autoskopie des Larynx und der Trachea. *Archiv Laryngol Rhinol;* 1885 Apr p.

- 617 156–64.
- 618 61. Zhu X-Y, Lin B-C, Zhang Q-S, Ye H-M, Yu R-J. A prospective evaluation of the efficacy
619 of the laryngeal mask airway during neonatal resuscitation. *Resuscitation*.
620 2011;82:1405–9.
- 621 62. Zanardo V, Simbi AK, Savio V, Micaglio M, Trevisanuto D. Neonatal Resuscitation by
622 Laryngeal Mask Airway after Elective Cesarean Section. *Fetal Diagn Ther*.
623 2004;19:228–31.
- 624 63. Micaglio M, Doglioni N, Parotto M, Zanardo V, Ori C, Trevisanuto D. Training for
625 neonatal resuscitation with the laryngeal mask airway: a comparison of the LMA-
626 ProSeal and the LMA-Classic in an airway management manikin. *Pediatric*
627 *Anesthesia*. 2006 Oct;16(10):1028–31.
- 628 64. Micaglio M, Trevisanuto D, Doglioni N, Zanette G, Zanardo V, Ori C. The size 1 LMA-
629 ProSeal™: Comparison with the LMA-Classic™ during pressure controlled ventilation
630 in a neonatal intubation manikin. *Resuscitation*. 2007;72:124–7.
- 631 65. Schebesta K, Hüpfel M, Ringl H, Machata A-M, Chiari A, Kimberger O. A comparison
632 of paediatric airway anatomy with the SimBaby high-fidelity patient simulator.
633 *Resuscitation*. 2011;82:468–72.
- 634 66. Falck AJ, Escobedo MB, Baillargeon JG, Villard LG, Gunkel JH. Proficiency of Pediatric
635 Residents in Performing Neonatal Endotracheal Intubation. *Pediatrics*
636 2011;112:1242–7.
- 637 67. Leone TA, Rich W, Finer NN. Neonatal intubation: Success of pediatric trainees. *J*
638 *Pediatr*. 2005;146:638–41.
- 639 68. O'Donnell CPF, Kamlin COF, Davis PG, Morley CJ. Endotracheal intubation attempts
640 during neonatal resuscitation: success rates, duration, and adverse effects.
641 *Pediatrics*. 2006;117:e16–21.
- 642 69. Schmölzer GM, Poulton DA, Dawson JA, Kamlin COF, Morley CJ, Davis PG.
643 Assessment of flow waves and colorimetric CO₂ detector for endotracheal tube
644 placement during neonatal resuscitation. *Resuscitation*. 2011;82:307–12.
- 645 70. Paterson S, Byrne P, Molesky M, Seal R. Neonatal resuscitation using the laryngeal
646 mask airway. *Anesthesiology*. 1993;79:983–3.
- 647 71. Trevisanuto D, Micaglio M, Pitton M, Magarotto M, Piva D, Zanardo V. Laryngeal
648 mask airway: is the management of neonates requiring positive pressure ventilation
649 at birth changing? *Resuscitation*. 2004;62:151–7.
- 650 72. Gandini D, Brimacombe JR. Neonatal resuscitation with the laryngeal mask airway in
651 normal and low birth weight infants. *Anaesth Analg*. 1999;89:642–3.
- 652 73. Zanardo V, Weiner G, Micaglio M, Doglioni N, Buzzacchero R, Trevisanuto D.

- 653 Delivery room resuscitation of near-term infants: Role of the laryngeal mask airway.
654 Resuscitation. 2010;81:327–30.
- 655 74. Singh R, Mohan C, Taxak S. Controlled trial to evaluate the use of LMA for neonatal
656 resuscitation. *J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol*. 2005;21:303.
- 657 75. Feroze F, Khuwaja A, Masood N, Malik FI. Neonatal Resuscitation: The Use of
658 Laryngeal Mask Airway. *Professional Med J*. 2008;15:148–52.
- 659 76. Trevisanuto D, Doglioni N, Mario F, Micaglio M, Parotto M, Zanardo V. Drug
660 administration via the laryngeal mask airway. *Resuscitation*. 2006 Nov;71(2):263–4.
- 661 77. Stewart C, Attridge J, Kattwinkel J. Randomized Controlled Trial of Surfactant
662 Administration by Laryngeal Mask Airway (LMA). PAS Annual Meeting 2008.
- 663 78. Santana-Rivas QR, Pinheiro J, Pezzano C. Randomized Controlled Trial of Rescue
664 Surfactant Delivery Via Laryngeal Mask Airway (LMA) vs Endotracheal Intubation in
665 Newborns with Respiratory Distress Syndrome (RDS). PAS Annual Meeting 2011.
- 666 79. Schmölzer GM, Kamlin COF, Dawson JA, Morley CJ, Davis PG. Tidal volume delivery
667 during surfactant administration in the delivery room. *Intensive Care Med*.
668 2011;37:1833–9.
- 669 80. Hentschel R, Jorch G. Acute side effects of surfactant treatment. *Journal of Perinatal
670 Medicine*. 2002;30:143–8.
- 671 81. Hentschel R, Brune T, Franke N, Harms E, Jorch G. Sequential changes in compliance
672 and resistance after bolus administration or slow infusion of surfactant in preterm
673 infants. *Intensive Care Med*. 2002;28:622–8.
- 674 82. Wheeler KI, Davis PG, Kamlin COF, Morley CJ. Assist control volume guarantee
675 ventilation during surfactant administration. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed*.
676 2009;94:F336–8.
- 677 83. Hudak ML, Martin DJ, Egan EA, Matteson EJ, Cummings J, Jung AL, et al. A
678 Multicenter Randomized Masked Comparison Trial of Synthetic Surfactant Versus
679 Calf Lung Surfactant Extract in the Prevention of Neonatal Respiratory Distress
680 Syndrome. *Pediatrics*. 1997;100:39–50
- 681 84. Brietzke SE, Mair EA. Laryngeal mask versus endotracheal tube in a ferret model.
682 *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryngol*. 2001;110:827–33.
- 683 85. Baraka A. Laryngeal mask airway for resuscitation of a newborn with Pierre-Robin
684 syndrome. *Anesthesiology*. 1995;83:646.
- 685 86. Markakis DA, Sayson SC, Schreiner MS. Insertion of the laryngeal mask airway in
686 awake infants with the Robin sequence. *Anesth Analg*. 1992;75:822–4.
- 687 87. Leal-Pavey YR. Use of the LMA classic to secure the airway of a premature neonate
688 with Smith-Lemli-Opitz syndrome: a case report. *AANA J*. 2004;72:427–30.

- 689 88. Trawoger R, MANN C, Mortl M, RIHA K. Use of laryngeal masks in the resuscitation
690 of a neonate with difficult airway. Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed. 1999;81:F159..
- 691 89. Schmölzer GM, Morley CJ, Wong C, Dawson JA, Kamlin COF, Donath SM, et al.
692 Respiratory function monitor guidance of mask ventilation in the delivery room: a
693 feasibility study. J Pediatr. 2012;160:377–381.e2.
- 694 90. Heard AMB, Green RJ, Eakins P. The formulation and introduction of a “can’t
695 intubate, can’t ventilate” algorithm into clinical practice. Anaesthesia. 2009;64:601–
696 8.
- 697 91. Finer NN, Muzyka D. Flexible endoscopic intubation of the neonate. Pediatr.
698 Pulmonol. 1992;12:48–51.
- 699 92. Vanderhal AL, Berci G, Simmons CF, Hagiike M. A Videolaryngoscopy Technique for
700 the Intubation of the Newborn: Preliminary Report. Pediatrics. 2009;124:e339–46.
- 701 93. Verghese C, Brimacombe JR. Survey of laryngeal mask airway usage in 11,910
702 patients: safety and efficacy for conventional and nonconventional usage. Anaesth
703 Analg. 1996;82:129–33.
- 704 94. Mizushima A, Wardall GJ, Simpson DL. The laryngeal mask airway in infants.
705 Anaesthesia. 1992;47:849–51.
- 706 95. Boehringer LA, Bennie RE. Laryngeal mask airway and the pediatric patient. Int
707 Anesthesiol Clin. 1998;36:45–60.
- 708 96. Davies PR, Tighe SQ, Greenslade GL, Evans GH. Laryngeal mask airway and tracheal
709 tube insertion by unskilled personnel. Lancet. 1990;336:977–9.
- 710 97. Lavies N. Use of the laryngeal mask airway in neonatal resuscitation. Anaesthesia.
711 1993;48:352–2.
- 712 98. Brimacombe J, Gandini D. Resuscitation of neonates with the laryngeal mask
713 airway—a caution. Pediatrics. 1995;95:453–4.
- 714 99. Esmail N, Saleh M, Ali A. Laryngeal mask airway versus endotracheal intubation for
715 Apgar score improvement in neonatal resuscitation. Egypt J Anesthesiol.
716 2002;18:115–21.
- 717 100. Flagg PJ. Treatment of asphyxia in the newborn. JAMA. 1928;91:788.
- 718 101. Trevisanuto D. The laryngeal mask airway: potential applications in neonates. Arch
719 Dis Child - Fetal Neonatal. 2004;89:F485–9.
- 720 102. Dunn PM. Dr James Blundell (1790-1878) and neonatal resuscitation. Arch Dis Child;
721 1989;64:494-5
- 722 103. Blaikley J, Gibberd G. Asphyxia Neonatorum: Its Treatment by Tracheal Intubation.
723 Lancet. 1935;225:736–9.

- 724 104. Berman RA, Lilienfeld S. To the editor. *Anesthesiology*. 1950;11:136–7.
- 725 105. Brain A. The development of the Laryngeal Mask--a brief history of the invention,
726 early clinical studies and experimental work from which the Laryngeal Mask
727 evolved. *Eur J anaesthesiol. Supplement*. 1991;4:5.
- 728 106. Denny N, Desilva K, Webber P. Laryngeal mask airway for emergency tracheostomy
729 in a neonate. *Anaesthesia*. 1990;45:895–5.
- 730

Table 1: Timeline of oropharyngeal airway devices (online supplement)

1834	J. Blundell describes digital intubation for the treatment of Asphyxia Neonatorum ¹⁰¹
1895	A. Kirstein invented the modern Laryngoscope ⁹⁹
1908	F.W. Hewitt describes a straight rubber tube, known to be the first artificial oral 'air-way' ⁴³
1915	J.E. Lumbard describes his controller of the tongue and palate during general anesthesia ⁴⁶
1922	F.W. Hewitt modified his airway into a curved rubber tube ⁴³ (Figure 1)
1928	P.J. Flagg described his technique of introducing a metal tube into the trachea using a small electrically lighted laryngoscope ¹⁰⁰
1930	R.M. Waters metal oropharyngeal airway, which had a straight bite-block section, an anatomically curved pharyngeal section, and an oval flange at the proximal end to prevent over insertion ⁴⁷
1933	A.E. Guedel describes the first oropharyngeal airway made of rubber with a small metal inlet as bite block ⁴⁸ (Figure 1)
1935	J.B. Blaikley and G.F. Gibberd suggest to use a rubber catheter instead of the rigid tube for endotracheal intubation ¹⁰²
1950	R.A. Berman designed the first reusable oropharyngeal airway made of plastic ¹⁰³
1981	A. Brain designed the Laryngeal mask airway ¹⁴
1988	Laryngeal mask airway becomes commercial available ¹⁰⁴
1990	N.M. Denny described the 1 st neonatal resuscitation using a LMA ¹⁰⁵
1999	Only case reported were laryngeal mask was used for epinephrine administration during cardio-pulmonary resuscitation ⁵⁹
2004	1 st surfactant administration via laryngeal mask airway in newborn infant ³⁰
2002, 2005, 2008, 2011	RCTs comparing LMA versus mask ventilation or endotracheal intubation ⁷²⁻⁷⁵ (Table 3)
2008, 2011	RCTs comparing LMA versus endotracheal tube for surfactant administration ^{78,79}
2012-ongoing	Oropharyngeal airway to reduce severe airway reduction ³³ (Table 4)
2012-ongoing	3 RCTs comparing LMA versus endotracheal tube for surfactant administration ³⁵⁻³⁷ (Table 4)

Table 2: PRISMA flow chart

Table 3: Risk of bias assessment of randomized control trial using LMA versus mask ventilation or endotracheal intubation

Study	Study population	Comparison	Main outcomes	Sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants, personnel and outcomes	Incomplete outcome data (attrition and exclusions)	Selective outcome reporting	Source of funding bias
Esmail et al. ⁷²	GA >35 wks or BW >2500g	LMA (n=20) vs. ETT (n=20)	Apgar scores; Time until heart rate >100/min; LMA and ETT insertion times; rate of successful insertion with 1 st attempt; total number of attempts required; duration of PPV;	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Low	Low
Singh et al. ⁷³	GA >35 wks or BW >1500g	LMA (n=25) vs. bag and mask (n=25).	Apgar scores; LMA insertion time; rate of successful insertion with 1 st attempt; total number of attempts required; success of ventilation, time required for improvement in color; duration of PPV	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Low	Low
Feroze et al. ⁷⁴	BW >1500g; APGAR Score <4/10 at birth; Newborns born via C/S	ETT (n=25) vs. BMV (n=25) vs. LMA (n=25)	Apgar scores; LMA and ETT insertion time; rate of successful insertion with 1 st attempt; total number of attempts required; success of ventilation, time required for improvement in color;	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Low	Low
Zhu et al. ⁷⁵	GA >34 wks or BW >2000g	LMA (n=205) vs. bag and mask (n=164)	Apgar scores; LMA insertion time; rate of successful insertion with 1 st attempt; total number of attempts required; response time; need for tracheal intubation	High	High	Uncertain	Uncertain	Low	Low

GA - gestational age, BW - birth weight, wks - weeks, g - gram, LMA - laryngeal airway mask, ETT - endotracheal tube, BMV - Bag and Mask Ventilation, C/S caesarian section

Table 4: Trials identified at clinicaltrials.gov

Study	Study population	Comparison	Primary outcome	Estimated enrollment	Status
Oropharyngeal airway					
Oropharyngeal airway for prevention of airway obstruction during positive pressure ventilation in preterm infants < 34 weeks gestation during neonatal resuscitation ³³	GA <34 wks requiring mask ventilation in the delivery room	Mask ventilation with or without a Guedel Tube.	Reduction in severe airway obstruction	132	Recruiting
Laryngeal mask airway					
Randomized Controlled Trial of Surfactant Delivery Via Laryngeal Mask Airway (LMA) Versus Endotracheal Intubation ³⁵	GA >29 & >37 weeks with an postnatal age of 4-48 hours	Surfactant administration via LMA vs. ETT (after premedication for pain)	Rate of failure of surfactant therapy	78	Recruiting
Efficacy Evaluation of Surfactant Administration Via Laryngeal Mask Airway ³⁷	BW >1000g and GA >28 & <35 wks with an postnatal age of <8 hours	Surfactant administration via LMA vs. ETT	Fraction of inspired oxygen	60	Not yet recruiting
Laryngeal Mask Airway (LMA) for Surfactant Administration in Neonates ³⁶	GA at time of enrollment > 28 & <36 wks with an postnatal age of <38 hours	Infants on nCPAP who receive surfactant via a LMA vs. infants who are maintained on nCPAP and do not receive surfactant.	Need for intubation and mechanical ventilation in the first seven days of life	144	Recruiting
Randomized Controlled Trial of Surfactant Administration by Laryngeal Mask Airway (LMA) ³⁴	BW >1200g with chronologic age of <72 hours	Infants with RDS who have not yet reached criteria for intubation, will be randomized to receive surfactant by LMA or to continue receiving standard therapy of nCPAP and supplemental oxygen	Rate of failure of surfactant therapy	380 (total of 26 infants were enrolled)	Terminated (due to low enrolment)

GA - gestational age, BW - birth weight, wks - weeks, g - gram, LMA - laryngeal airway mask, ETT - endotracheal tube, nCPAP - Nasal continuous positive airway pressure, RDS - respiratory distress syndrome

Figure 1**A** **B**

Figure 2

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Schmoelzer, GM;Agarwal, M;Kamlin, COF;Davis, PG

Title:

Supraglottic airway devices during neonatal resuscitation: An historical perspective, systematic review and meta-analysis of available clinical trials

Date:

2013-06-01

Citation:

Schmoelzer, G. M., Agarwal, M., Kamlin, C. O. F. & Davis, P. G. (2013). Supraglottic airway devices during neonatal resuscitation: An historical perspective, systematic review and meta-analysis of available clinical trials. RESUSCITATION, 84 (6), pp.722-730. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2012.11.002>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/43989>