

References

1. Wernet A, Bougeois B, Merckx P, Paugam-Burtz C, Mantz J: Successful use of succinylcholine for cesarean delivery in a patient with postpolio syndrome. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 2007; 107:680-1

2. Martyn J, Richtsfeld M: Succinylcholine-induced hyperkalemia in acquired pathologic states: Etiologic factors and molecular mechanisms. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 2006; 104:158-69

(Accepted for publication January 30, 2008.)

Anesthesiology 2008; 108:1153

Copyright © 2008, the American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Inc.

Beach Chair Position: Is It Really Feasible in Laparoscopic Procedures?

To the Editor:—In the November 2007 issue of *ANESTHESIOLOGY*, Valenza *et al.*¹ described how they used the application of positive end-expiratory pressure and the beach chair position to counteract the respiratory derangements in morbidly obese patients undergoing laparoscopic gastric surgery. The authors state that although both the beach chair position and the addition of positive end-expiratory pressure each similarly improved lung volumes, oxygenation, and respiratory mechanics at baseline, it was only the combination of both positive end-expiratory pressure and the beach chair position that improved oxygenation during pneumoperitoneum. Because it is often the practice of surgeons to ask their anesthesiology colleagues to place the patients in some degree of Trendelenburg to “facilitate” the exposure during laparoscopic surgeries, we are forced to question how feasible it would be to use the beach chair position in any laparoscopic procedure, let alone in morbidly obese patients. Moreover, in certain types of laparoscopic surgeries (prostatectomies, and some gynecologic surgeries), extreme Trendelenburg is requested, thus making the use of beach chair position even more impractical. A number of variables contribute to the respiratory derangements in all anesthetized patients; notable among them are the general anesthetic, paralytics, pneumoperitoneum, and positioning. The authors describe performing

recruitment maneuvers (three consecutive inspiratory holds of 5 s at 45 cm H₂O airway pressure) in both positions, with and without pneumoperitoneum, to improve respiratory derangements. Although it is not always possible to consistently maintain improved oxygenation for a prolonged period of time after performing the recruitment maneuvers, it is quite more practical to perform these maneuvers as opposed to attempting to use the beach chair position when performing laparoscopic procedures.

Jagtar Singh Heir, D.O.,* Vijaya Gottumukkala, M.B.B.S.
*University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas.
jsheir@mdanderson.org

Reference

1. Valenza F, Vagginelli F, Tiby A, Francesconi S, Ronzoni G, Guglielmi M, Zappa M, Lattuada E, Gattinoni L: Effects of the beach chair position, positive end-expiratory pressure, and pneumoperitoneum on respiratory function in morbidly obese patients during anesthesia and paralysis. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 2007; 107:725-32

(Accepted for publication February 20, 2008.)

Anesthesiology 2008; 108:1153-4

Copyright © 2008, the American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Inc.

In Reply:—Drs. Singh Heir and Gottumukkala are right: If a surgeon asks for an “extreme Trendelenburg” position, one cannot use the head-up position as a strategy to counteract hypoxemia, unless in an emergency!

The negative effects of the Trendelenburg position have been investigated by others.¹⁻³ Any conclusion taken from our data on the Trendelenburg position is merely speculative, provided we set out to investigate the beach chair position and positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP).⁴ Nevertheless, our data allow some speculations on the aspect brought up by Drs. Singh Heir and Gottumukkala in their letter.

In a sedated and paralyzed patient, pleural pressures displace the relaxed diaphragm downward, hence increasing end-expiratory lung volume, while intraabdominal pressure (IAP) acts as a counter pressure on the diaphragm. When the bowels are allowed to slide under gravity in the head-up position, bladder pressure increases, as we have shown (from 17.87 ± 5.45 to 23.92 ± 4.35 cm H₂O; $P < 0.01$). The increase of bladder pressure in head-up position may thus correspond to a reduction of pressure pushing the diaphragm upward. When we estimated pleural pressure as $P_{pl} = (PEEP + PEEP_i) \times Ew/(E_l + Ew)^5$ in the supine and beach chair positions with and without PEEP, and considered changes of IAP due to the beach chair position (ΔIAP) to obtain an indicative “push-down pressure” ($P_{pl} + \Delta IAP$), we found that this was positively correlated with end-expiratory lung volume ($R^2 = 0.857$, $P < 0.001$, $m = 0.67$, multiple linear regression analysis). We did not measure IAP changes occurring in the extreme Trendelenburg position. How-

ever, we would anticipate that an increase in the forces shifting the diaphragm upward would ensue following the same physical rule. In this condition, PEEP (hence P_{pl}) may be used as a counterpressure that opposes diaphragm upward shift, thus preserving lung volume.

Recruitment maneuvers proposed by Drs. Singh Heir and Gottumukkala to improve oxygenation have been discussed in our article.⁴ They are possibly even more important in the extreme Trendelenburg position than in the supine position to open up the lung. However, their effects are short-lived,⁶ whereas PEEP is known to maintain lung units open, once recruited.

Franco Valenza, M.D.,* Luciano Gattinoni, M.D., F.R.C.P.
*Fondazione Policlinico Ospedale Maggiore, Mangiagalli e Regina Elena-IRCCS, Milano, Italy. franco.valenza@unimi.it

References

1. Oikonen M, Tallgren M: Changes in respiratory compliance at laparoscopy: Measurements using side stream spirometry. *Can J Anaesth* 1995; 42:495-7
2. Odeberg S, Ljungqvist O, Svenberg T, Gannedahl P, Backdahl M, von Rosen A, Sollevi A: Haemodynamic effects of pneumoperitoneum and the influence of posture during anaesthesia for laparoscopic surgery. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 1994; 38:276-83
3. Drummond M: Pressure-volume relationships in the lung during laparoscopy. *Br J Anaesth* 1978; 50:261-70
4. Valenza F, Vagginelli F, Tiby A, Francesconi S, Ronzoni G, Guglielmi M, Zappa M, Lattuada E, Gattinoni L: Effects of the beach chair position, positive end-expiratory pressure, and pneumoperitoneum on respiratory function in morbidly obese patients during anesthesia and paralysis. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 2007; 107:725-32

5. Gattinoni L, Carlesso E, Cadringer P, Valenza F, Vaggini F, Chiumello D: Physical and biological triggers of ventilator-induced lung injury and its prevention. *Eur Respir J Suppl* 2003; 47:15s–25s

6. Whalen FX, Gajic O, Thomson GB, Kendrick ML, Que FL, Williams BA, Joyner MJ, Hubmayr RD, Warner DO, Sprung J: The effects of the alveolar

recruitment maneuver and positive end-expiratory pressure on arterial oxygenation during laparoscopic bariatric surgery. *Anesth Analg* 2006; 102:298–305

(Accepted for publication February 20, 2008.)

Anesthesiology 2008; 108:1154

Copyright © 2008, the American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Inc.

Laryngeal Mask Airway and Children's Risk of Perioperative Respiratory Complications: Randomized Controlled Studies Are Required to Discriminate Cause and Effect

To the Editor:—We read with interest the study of von Ungern-Sternberg *et al.*¹ evaluating the incidence of adverse perioperative respiratory events in children recovering from an upper respiratory infection (URI). The authors found that the presence of a recent URI within the previous 2 weeks (as reported by their parents) significantly increased the incidence of laryngospasm, coughing, and oxygen desaturation. They also observed that the incidence of these respiratory events was even higher when there were multiple attempts to insert the laryngeal mask airway (LMA). The authors concluded from these observational data that the use of an LMA in children with a recent URI (<2 weeks) enhances the risk of adverse respiratory events, and suggested that “if anesthesiologists allow at least a 2-week interval after a URI, they can safely proceed with anesthesia using an LMA.”¹ Although we commend the authors for having reported interesting new information on this complex subject, we are not convinced that their conclusions are entirely supported by data.

Certainly the breadth of pediatric experience has been that children with a URI have a higher incidence of airway-related complications. The current study confirms the expected,² *i.e.*, children with infected or recently infected airways are likely to have more respiratory complications compared with children who did not have a history of a recent URI. However, we do not agree with the suggestion of von Ungern-Sternberg *et al.*¹ that the use of an LMA in children with a recent URI enhances the risk of adverse respiratory events. In contrast, it has been shown that children whose airway is managed with an endotracheal tube have a higher incidence of respiratory complications than those managed with an LMA,³ and it is for this reason that an LMA is frequently used in place of an endotracheal tube. In the study of von Ungern-Sternberg *et al.*, it remains unclear whether the insertion of the laryngeal mask *per se* increased the risk of respiratory events or whether the increased incidence of respiratory events observed with multiple attempts to insert an LMA¹ was simply an epiphenomenon. When multiple attempts were made to place an LMA, was the subsequent adverse respiratory event really related to the insertion of an LMA, or rather due to difficult anatomical conditions (e.g., tonsillar hypertrophy), or light or inadequate anesthesia? The latter suggestions could explain in part the higher incidence of laryngospasm⁴ compared with a similar study.⁴

It is always useful to examine methodologic principles before reaching conclusions on cause-effect relations: Randomized controlled trials are usually required. The purpose of randomized controlled trials is to clear the uncertainties surrounding a clinical or research issue and involves isolating the “treatment” and “end result” variables from external influences.

In the current study, we are not sure whether the conclusion should be drawn that “if anesthesiologists allow at least a 2-week interval after

a URI, they can safely proceed with anesthesia using an LMA”¹ because children were not cancelled and rescheduled 2 weeks after their URI. This is an especially important detail because 3.6, 9.0, and 6.4% of the children considered as having no URI in the study of von Ungern-Sternberg *et al.* in fact had fever, dry cough, or wet cough, respectively. Therefore, it could be argued that a control group without a URI was missing in this study,¹ and comparisons of perioperative respiratory complications might have been made instead between children with URIs of different severities.

The specific question that remains unanswered is: Does postponing anesthesia by 2 weeks after a URI result in fewer airway-related complications? Such a study would probably require larger numbers of children to be included and would definitely need to be tightly controlled. In fact, it takes 6–8 weeks for airway irritability to resolve after a URI, by which time many children will have another URI.⁵ Moreover, waiting several weeks after a URI seems not to consistently reduce the incidence of perioperative respiratory complications.⁶ From a *clinical* standpoint, we support the authors' view that children who have not had a URI within the past few weeks may be safely anesthetized despite the perhaps unavoidably increased risk.

Therefore, the URI dilemma⁶ remains an issue. Randomized controlled studies are required to determine the optimal point of time after a URI for administering anesthesia and to learn how to optimize the technique for airway management.

Matthias Eikermann, M.D., Ph.D.,* Charles J. Coté, M.D.

*Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts. Universitätsklinikum Essen, Essen, Germany. meikermann@partners.org

References

1. von Ungern-Sternberg BS, Boda K, Schwab C, Sims C, Johnson C, Habre W: Laryngeal mask airway is associated with an increased incidence of adverse respiratory events in children with recent upper respiratory tract infections. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 2007; 107:714–9
2. Rolf N, Cote CJ: Frequency and severity of desaturation events during general anesthesia in children with and without upper respiratory infections. *J Clin Anesth* 1992; 4:200–3
3. Tait AR, Pandit UA, Voepel-Lewis T, Munro HM, Malviya S: Use of the laryngeal mask airway in children with upper respiratory tract infections: A comparison with endotracheal intubation. *Anesth Analg* 1998; 86:706–11
4. Tait AR, Malviya S, Voepel-Lewis T, Munro HM, Seiwert M, Pandit UA: Risk factors for perioperative adverse respiratory events in children with upper respiratory tract infections. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 2001; 95:299–306
5. Empey DW: Effect of airway infections on bronchial reactivity. *Eur J Respir Dis Suppl* 1983; 128(pt 1):366–8.
6. Cote CJ: The upper respiratory tract infection (URI) dilemma: Fear of a complication or litigation? *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 2001; 95:283–5

(Accepted for publication February 22, 2008.)