cal studies, we believe that this topic would benefit from carefully conducted retrospective data analysis as in most practices respective cases are rare.

Michael Aziz, M.D.,* Ansgar Brambrink, M.D., Ph.D.
*Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon. azizm@ohsu.edu

References

1. Aziz MF, Dillman D, Fu R, Brambrink AM: Comparative effectiveness of the C-MAC video laryngoscope *versus* direct laryngoscopy in the setting of the predicted difficult airway. ANESTHESIOLOGY 2012; 116:629–36
2. Aziz MF, Healy D, Kheterpal S, Fu RF, Dillman D, Brambrink AM: Routine clinical practice effectiveness of the Glidescope in difficult airway management: An analysis of 2,004 Glidescope intubations, complications, and failures from two institutions. ANESTHESIOLOGY 2011; 114:34–41
3. Cooper RM, Pacey JA, Bishop MJ, McCluskey SA: Early clinical experience with a new videolaryngoscope (GlideScope) in 728 patients. Can J Anaesth 2005; 52:191–8
4. Yentis SM: Predicting difficult intubation–worthwhile exercise or pointless ritual? Anaesthesia 2002; 57:105–9

(Accepted for publication June 12, 2012.)

Tracheal Intubation Performed with GlideScope® Video Laryngoscope and Direct Laryngoscopy in Neonates and Infants

To the Editor:

Fiadjoe *et al.*[1] should be applauded for their efforts in comparing the performance of the GlideScope Cobalt® video laryngoscope (GCV) (Verathon Medical, Bothell, WA)‡ with the Miller laryngoscope (Heine, Dover, NH) for tracheal intubation in neonates and infants with a normal airway. Quite rightly, the primary outcomes of this study are intubation time and success rate with the two devices. However, there are several issues of the study that need to be clarified.

The authors did not indicate how many of the neonates aged younger than 1 month and the infants aged 1–12 months were included in each group. Is a size 1 Miller blade the best selection for all patients in the direct laryngoscopy group? In our experience, a size 0 Miller blade is more useful than a size 1 Miller blade in the neonates. In the GCV group, a size 2 blade of the GCV was selected. However, an important issue ignored by the authors is bodyweight range of patients. The GCV is a single-use version of the original GlideScope® video laryngoscope. The most important improvement in the GCV is the availability of a 10-mm blade, compared with 14.5 mm in original models.[2] As yet, there are five disposable blades of the GCV available. In the manufacturer's description, the blade choice of the GCV is based on bodyweight of patients. The recommended blade sizes are size 0 for patients weighing less than 1.5 kg, size 1 for patients weighing 1.5–3.6 kg, size 2 for patients weighing 1.8–10 kg, size 3 for patients weighing 10 kg, or adults, and size 4 for patients weighing 40 kg, or morbidly obese patients. Because each blade covers a wide bodyweight range and the infant's airway is typically 3 or 4 mm in diameter, the laryngoscopic view of the GCV may vary with the size of the blade.

The authors compared the percentage of glottic opening score obtained by the two devices, and demonstrated that the GCV yielded a better laryngoscopic view than the Miller laryngoscope. We were also very interested in the use of maneuvers to aid laryngoscopy in this study, especially for the use of optimum external laryngeal manipulation. It is generally recommend that optimum external laryngeal manipulation should be used with a poor laryngoscopic view in order to improve visualization with direct laryngoscopy.[3] Benumof and Cooper[4] demonstrated that optimum external laryngeal manipulation may improve the laryngoscopic view by at least one whole grade in adults. Smilarly, this maneuver has proved effective for direct laryngoscopy in pediatric patients.[5] In the clinical studies comparing performance of Glidescope® video laryngoscope with direct laryngoscope for tracheal intubation in pediatric patients with normal and difficult airways,[6,7] optimum external laryngeal manipulation has also been shown to provide improved laryngoscopic view. In methods, we do not feel that the authors clearly described if they had adopted an optimal-best attempt at laryngoscopy when evaluating the best views obtained with the two laryngoscopes.

Fu-Shan Xue, M.D.,* Yi Cheng, M.D., Qiang Wang, M.D.
*Plastic Surgery Hospital, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences and Peking Union Medical College, Beijing, People's Republic of China. fruitxue@yahoo.com.cn

References

1. Fiadjoe JE, Gurnaney H, Dalesio N, Sussman E, Zhao H, Zhang X, Stricker PA: A prospective randomized equivalence trial of the GlideScope Cobalt® video laryngoscope to traditional direct laryngoscopy in neonates and infants. ANESTHESIOLOGY 2012; 116:622–8
2. Holm-Knudsen R: The difficult pediatric airway–A review of new devices for indirect laryngoscopy in children younger than two years of age. Paediatr Anaesth 2011; 21:98–103
3. Hagberg CA, Benumof JL: The American Society of Anesthesiologists' management of difficult airway algorithm and explanation–analysis of the algorithm. In: Hagberg CA, ed. Benumof's Airway Management. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Mosby; 2007:245
4. Benumof JL, Cooper SD: Quantitative improvement in laryngoscopic view by optimal external laryngeal manipulation. J Clin Anesth 1996; 8:136–40
5. Podraza AG, Ansari-Winn D, Salem MR, Heyman JH, Mahdi M: Tracheolaryngeal cephalad displacement facilitates tracheal intubation in pediatric patients. Anesth Analg 1995; 80:S377
6. Kim JT, Na HS, Bae JY, Kim DW, Kim HS, Kim CS, Kim SD: GlideScope video laryngoscope: A randomized clinical trial in 203 paediatric patients. Br J Anaesth 2008; 101:531–4
7. Armstrong J, John J, Karsli C: A comparison between the

‡ http://www.verathon.com/products/glidescope.aspx. Accessed July 10, 2012.

GlideScope Video Laryngoscope and direct laryngoscope in paediatric patients with difficult airways–a pilot study. Anaesthesia 2010; 65:353–7

(Accepted for publication June 25, 2012.)

In Reply:

We thank Xue *et al.* for their recent letter regarding our recent article[1] and are happy to respond to their questions and comments.

Their first question related to the number of neonates included in the study. We had two neonates in our study; one was randomized to the GlideScope (Verathon Medical, Bothell, WA) and the other to direct laryngoscopy (Heine, Dover, NH). We routinely use a size 1 Miller blade in the normal neonatal population without difficulty in our institution and reserve the size 0 mostly for premature neonates. Xue *et al.* further questioned our choice of blade size for the GlideScope Cobalt. Before conducting our study, we piloted various sizes of the GlideScope blade and found that the size 2 blade provided optimal views in our patient population. All our patients fell within the manufacturer body weight guidelines for the size 2 blade; however, manufacturer guidelines are not always consistent with individual patient requirements. The GlideScope device and blade sizes have evolved and have been redesigned several times. For example, a size 3 blade was recommended for patients weighing more than 10 kg at the time of our study. It would have been physically impossible to place a size 3 blade in the pharynx of a normal 11-kg 1-yr-old patient because of the blade's size. Recently, a new size 2.5 blade has been introduced, and weight guidelines have been adjusted accordingly. Manufacturer-suggested blade sizes in children should be accepted cautiously until validated by clinical evaluation.

Xue *et al.* state that optimum external laryngeal manipulation should be used with poor laryngoscopic views to improve visualization. We agree with this assertion, and optimum external laryngeal manipulation was permitted in our study and used when the view was poor. However, we did not track the number of maneuvers performed to optimize laryngoscopic view. Although this information may have been useful, we chose to capture this as a component of the time to best view. This could be one of the contributing factors to the difference in time to best view between the GlideScope and traditional direct laryngoscopy (median time GlideScope = 8.1 s, direct laryngoscopy = 9.9 s, $P = 0.03$).

John E. Fiadjoe, M.D.,* Paul Stricker, M.D., Harshad Gurnaney, M.D. *The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Perlman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. fiadjoej@email.chop.edu

Reference

1. Fiadjoe JE, Gurnaney H, Dalesio N, Sussman E, Zhao H, Zhang X, Stricker PA: A prospective randomized equivalence trial of the GlideScope Cobalt® video laryngoscope to traditional direct laryngoscopy in neonates and infants. Anesthesiology 2012; 116:622–8

(Accepted for publication June 25, 2012.)

Whole Blood: More than the Sum of the Parts

To the Editor:

Dr. Weiskopf's editorial, "Reconstructing Deconstructed Blood for Trauma,"[1] should prompt serious examination of conventional blood banking practices, not just as they pertain to trauma, but also to other areas of patient care that involve significant blood component transfusion. He mentions two small trials in adult cardiac surgery that have had less-than-convincing results,[2,3] but he omitted one landmark study in pediatric cardiac surgery. Manno *et al.* at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, compared use of whole blood and "reconstituted" blood (packed erythrocytes, fresh frozen plasma, and platelets) in children undergoing cardiac surgery with cardiopulmonary bypass.[4] This study showed that in the highest risk group, children less than 2 yr of age having high complexity surgery, postoperative blood loss in the group receiving reconstituted blood was around twice that of the whole blood group. Very fresh whole blood did not have a significant advantage over whole blood stored for 24–48 h. In addition, they showed that the platelets in reconstituted blood had significantly more abnormal aggregation in response to adenosine diphosphate, epinephrine, and collagen, suggesting that preservation of platelet function may be one reason for the superiority of whole blood in treating the postcardiopulmonary bypass coagulopathy. Lavee *et al.* showed a similar effect of whole blood on preservation of platelet function by showing that platelet aggregation as assessed by electron microscopy after cardiopulmonary bypass in adult patients was restored by 1 unit of whole blood to a level equivalent to 8–10 platelet units.[5] It is not only patients (of trauma and otherwise) who would benefit from more widespread use of whole blood in terms of clinical outcome and limitation of their exposure to donors. Somewhat counterintuitively, use of whole blood may also help eke out a dwindling blood supply by being substantially more efficient than components, particularly platelets, which may have lost much of their efficacy in the process of being separated and stored apart. It will require effort by clinicians to convince the blood bank community that the whole is more than the sum of the parts.

Andrew D. Pitkin, M.B.B.S., M.R.C.P., F.R.C.A.,* Mark J. Rice, M.D. *University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, Florida. apitkin@anest.ufl.edu

References

1. Weiskopf RB: Reconstructing deconstructed blood for trauma. Anesthesiology 2012; 116:518–21
2. Triulzi DJ, Gilmor GD, Ness PM, Baumgartner WA, Schultheis