To the Editor—The recent article by Thille et al.1 and the accompanying editorial by Rouby2 discuss the effects of positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) on pulmonary recruitability in patients with adult respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS). Thille et al. found that alveolar recruitment was similar in pulmonary and extrapulmonary ARDS and concluded that PEEP levels should not be determined based on cause of ARDS.3 However, the type of ARDS could not be classified in 37% of the patients in their retrospective study,1 an important point that is further discussed in Rouby’s editorial.2 In the study by Thille et al., the response to PEEP was assessed by pressure-volume curves only, and the effect of PEEP on oxygenation is not reported.

More than 30 yr ago, we described the variable effect of PEEP on oxygenation in patients with ARDS.3–4 We found that both the short-term and the long-term effects of PEEP on oxygenation response in patients with sepsis were statistically smaller compared with that in patients without sepsis, and we concluded that ARDS associated with sepsis seems to be the result of a more severe pulmonary insult.3 In a subgroup of trauma patients, we found again that the improvement in oxygenation after the application of PEEP in patients who developed sepsis was significantly smaller than that of patients without sepsis and without lung contusion.4

As imperfect as they are by today’s standards, these two very old studies do have relevance to the ongoing discussion about the effectiveness of pulmonary recruitment in ARDS because, in contrast to Thille et al.’s findings, they support the view that the effectiveness of PEEP does depend on the etiology of ARDS. It is unfortunate that for too many years we have not made much progress in better defining the various subgroups of ARDS. The clinician at the bedside is still left with one option only, namely, apply PEEP and assess its consequences. In fact, the response to PEEP may help in making the diagnosis.

Azriel Perel, M.D., Sheba Medical Center, Tel Aviv University, Tel Hashomer, Israel. perelao@shani.net
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John Quincy Adams Ward Did Not Create the Ether Monument

To the Editor—We thoroughly enjoyed reading “A Tale of Two Paintings.” However, the article presents one misleading—although minor—detail; it states that sculptor John Quincy Adams Ward (1830–1910) “created the Ether Monument.” Although Adams Ward sculpted the Good Samaritan group atop the Monument and the four bas-reliefs on the base, he did not design the Monument. Henry Van Brunt (1836–1903), of the Ware and Van Brunt architectural firm (Boston, MA), is considered the Monument’s architect; the letter he wrote to Adams Ward, asking him to sculpt these pieces, included his early sketch of the Monument. There are, however, other individuals who might have contributed to the Ether Monument’s design. William Ware (1832–1915), Van Brunt’s partner, wrote in the 1866 Harvard Yearbook that his activities included the design of the Ether Monument. It is not certain whether he was referring to himself personally or to his firm with Van Brunt. John La Farge (1835–1910), a painter and friend of Van Brunt, may also have had a hand in designing the Ether Monument. In the 1970s, La Farge’s grandson encountered sketches resembling the Monument and, despite some slight differences between the drawing and the Monument, surmised that his grandfather might have influenced the memorial’s design.

Rafael A. Ortega, M.D.,* Dina H. Hafez, B.A. *Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts. ortega@bu.edu

REFERENCES


Accepted for publication August 8, 2007.
In Reply.—On behalf of all the authors, I wish to thank Dr. Ortega and Ms. Hafez for this historical clarification regarding the design of the Ether Monument.

Sukumar P. Desai, M.D., Brigham and Women’s Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts. sdesai@partners.org
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The Use of Simulation Education in Competency Assessment: More Questions than Answers

To the Editor.—With great interest many anesthesia educators have read three manuscripts in previous issues of ANESTHESIOLOGY. Morgan, a well-known and respected researcher in simulation education, and her coauthors presented a thoughtful description of the use of simulation in the evaluation of teamwork in obstetrical practice.1 However, in light of their conclusions that the “study does not support the use of Human Factors Rating Scale for assessment of obstetrical teams” and recommended limited use of the Global Rating Scale, taken along with Murray and Enarson’s reflective editorial2 on the difficulties of teamwork and communication skills assessment, I fear that some anesthesia educators might be tempted to throw the newly born discipline of “simulation based assessment” out with the proverbial bathwater.

Morgan et al.’s investigation1 raises several issues that need to be addressed in light of our urgent need to develop authentic teaching and assessment of clinical competency in anesthesia.3 The pressing is our need for reliable and valid performance assessment tools used in anesthesia education, training, and practice.

Morgan et al. found the Human Factors Rating Scale and Global Rating Scale assessment tools of limited reliability in the obstetrical setting; however, they do not further examine the sources of variance in the reliability other than from the raters themselves. Although the number of raters, the number of items, and the occasions of testing seem to be sufficient, we have no definitive analysis of this. Classic Test Theory and the use of interrater reliability and inter- and intraclass correlations for diagnosis of measurement error does not provide a view of the relative importance or interactions of these and other variances sources. Modern Test Theory, specifically Generalizability Theory, provides an analysis of multiple sources of variance and determination of optimal sampling not only for raters but also for subjects, items, and occasions of testing.4–6 In this investigation,1 the nonconcordance of the correlations of both Human Factors Rating Scale and Global Rating Scale suggest that something else is going on here. It could be the result of nonparallel scenarios, lack of rater training, or (more significantly), faulty construct validity of the Human Factors Rating Scale and Global Rating Scale for the anesthesia Crisis Resource Management trait. However, we do not know from this report.

On reviewing of the original development of the Human Factors Rating Scale7 and its 2000 revision, we still do not have formal psychometric analysis of its construct validity and factor status “due to limited sample size.”8 Although its authors claim that the items cluster around “team roles, authority/command structure, stress recognition and organizational climate,”8 these highly complex behaviors warrant more formal factor analysis before general use. We as anesthesiologists would not use a new clinical test without knowing the measure of its specificity and sensitivity; we should be equally rigorous with the degree of validity and reliability in high-stakes testing and use of resource-intensive instruction. Modern Test Theory offers many advantages necessary for the authentic assessment of complex cognitive, technical, and behaviors skills in simulation-based education and performance assessment.9

Alice A. Edler, M.D., M.A., M.P.H., Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California. edlera@stanford.edu
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In Reply.—We would like to thank Dr. Edler for her interest in our editorial.1 In an innovative study that measured teamwork during simulated obstetric emergencies, Morgan et al. found that the team scores were not reliable.2 The investigators attributed the limited reliability to the use of the Human Factors Rating Scale. Dr. Edler correctly indicates that the limited reliability could be the result of several factors and that a generalizability analysis that partitioned the variance associated with scoring method, raters, and scenario would help to clarify the findings. Regardless of the cause of the limited reliability, Morgan et al.’s main conclusion would still stand.

“Simulation education” or, perhaps more appropriately, simulation-based assessment, has stimulated interest in interpreting participant or team scores. The reliability and validity of scores obtained during a simulation (or any performance assessment) depend on the event and environment’s authenticity, how effectively the scoring instrument captures the skills of interest, and whether the raters consistently observe and record the performance. Morgan et al.’s experimental design offers an important first step in evaluating teamwork in that it includes high-fidelity simulated obstetric emergencies that can be managed by a multidisciplinary team. Hopefully, rather than discouraging educators, the chal-
In Reply—We would like to thank Dr. Edler for her interest in our article. First and foremost, in no way are we suggesting that simulation education be discarded, but, as Dr. Edler comments, there is a pressing need to ensure that we are assessing its impact using valid, reliable tools.

We also agree with Dr. Edler that generalizability is the way of the future and in fact is the analytic basis of our current ongoing study, designed to examine the psychometric properties of a newly developed obstetric team performance tool.

Our study was based on a sample size and using a design that would make the use of multifaceted generalizability analyses complicated at best. In fact, a generalizability analysis would likely be unstable because individuals were partially nested within team, and team was nested within scenario, and the number of actual performances was small for a generalizability analysis, which is why, ultimately, we adopted the analytic techniques we did for the study in question.

However, rater was fully crossed with all the dimensions that Dr. Edler described as other potential sources of variance, and it was the interrater reliability of the Human Factors Rating Scale that was a problem. Although we agree that other facets might add further error, there is no reason to believe that the interrater reliability would be better understood through the partitioning of other variances. With regard to the Human Factors Rating Scale, as Dr. Edler suggests, undoubtedly “something else is going on here.” However, based on our findings in the study, we have become substantially less interested in figuring out that “something else” than we might otherwise have been.

Instead, we decided that it will ultimately be more profitable to start from scratch, developing a tool that is generated out of the practice and experience of healthcare teams, rather than to spend our resources investigating a better understanding of what we think will ultimately prove to be the wrong tool.

Although we have independently come to the same opinions as Dr. Edler regarding the types of studies needed, based on our preliminary data, we decided that we will be looking to tools other than the Human Factors Rating Scale as the subject of these more elaborate generalizability analyses.

Pamela J. Morgan, M.D., C.C.F.P., F.R.C.P.C.,* Richard Pittini, M.D., M.Ed., F.R.C.S.C., Glenn Regehr, Ph.D,* Women’s College Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. pam.morgan@utoronto.ca
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ated by an oxidative stressor acting on the coronary microcirculation. A hyperoxia-induced decrease in coronary microcirculatory blood flow in patients with coronary artery stenosis can be detrimental.

To determine whether the routine use of high inspired oxygen concentration during the perioperative period alters the incidence of surgical site infection in a general surgical population, a double-blind, randomized controlled trial was conducted. The incidence of surgical site infection was significantly higher (25%) in the group receiving inspired oxygen concentration of 80% than in the group with inspired oxygen concentration of 35% (11.3%). This is further evidence that does not support the argument of Forkner et al.

Supplemental oxygen benefits patients who would otherwise suffer hypoxia while breathing room air. However, in this situation, supplemental oxygen would not induce hyperoxia. Forkner et al. made no distinction between supplemental oxygenation and the administration of high oxygen concentration.

The effect of hyperoxia-induced hypoxia on decreases in cerebral blood flow or other organ flow may not be great and is unlikely to be of clinical significance. However, the independent vasoconstrictive effect of hyperoxia is too great in magnitude to be ignored. One cannot say that hyperoxia is harmless.

Anesthesiology 2008; 108:169–70

In Reply—We thank Dr. Her for his comments on our article. He notes that a previous human study by Floyd et al. demonstrated that the magnitude of the decrease in cerebral blood flow (CBF) induced by 100% oxygen administration is more profound than that of the increase in arterial oxygen content, which seems to support the notion that hyperoxia can induce tissue hypoxia. This study, which used arterial spin-labeled perfusion magnetic resonance imaging, reported a 29-33% decrease in CBF during 100% oxygen breathing. If the 30% reduction were accurate, then Dr. Her may have a point. However, this reduction in CBF is significantly greater than what has been observed in other studies, in which the reduction has been on the order of 5-15%. Unfortunately the investigators in the Floyd et al. study made unwarranted assumptions. For instance, they assumed that T1 for blood was 1000 and T1 for tissue was 900. Because of the small sample size, tissue PO2 and infection rate, and the bulk of evidence supports the routine use of perioperative hyperoxia in a general surgical population: A randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2004; 291:79-87
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To the Editor—We read the article by Mhyre and colleagues with interest. Although in the United Kingdom problems with tracheal intubation during obstetric general anesthesia remain the leading cause of death, there were no cases in their series from 1985 to 2003 suggesting that anesthesia providers in Michigan have been able to address this risk successfully. This is especially commendable as the rate of general anesthesia deaths, largely resulting from intubation problems or aspiration, was stable in the United States from 1979 to 1990. Many deaths in Mhyre et al.’s article were related to problems occurring some time after the induction of anesthesia. There are considerable differences between the United States and United Kingdom in anesthesia staffing both in the operating room and on the delivery suite, but the United Kingdom Confidential Enquiries into Maternal Deaths have repeatedly highlighted the vital role of the anesthesiologist in overall maternity care rather than just during surgery.

However, we were surprised that there was no mention of regional anesthesia problems in the abstract or the accompanying editorial, as intubation during obstetric general anesthesia remains the leading cause of death.2 We need to recognize that cardiovascular collapse and unconsciousness from high block may occur suddenly at any stage during regional anesthesia and lead to morbidity or death unless managed promptly and effectively.3,9

stephen.kinsella@ubht.nhs.uk
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"In Reply:"—We thank Kinsella et al. for their excellent comments. Our case series did include three women who suffered catastrophic complications after regional anesthesia for cesarean delivery. The mechanism of death in each of these cases was unique. One patient developed high spinal from an inadvertent intrathecal pharmacologic test dose during epidural catheter placement. Despite prompt and successful conversion to general anesthesia, she experienced massive myocardial infarction. Another died from neuraxial cardiac arrest following spinal anesthesia, with cardiovascular collapse preceding delivery of her neonate. The third patient became apneic en route to the postanesthesia care unit after a spinal anesthetic supplemented with intravenous medications.

Regional anesthesia may be safer than general anesthesia, but respiratory arrest or cardiovascular collapse may still occur during induction, maintenance, or recovery. Skills in basic airway management and cardiopulmonary resuscitation are essential for the entire team of perioperative care providers, regardless of whether the patient receives general or regional anesthesia.

Jill M. Mhyre, M.D.,† Monica N. Riesner Servin, M.D., Linda S. Polley, M.D., Norah N. Naughton, M.D., M.B.A. †University of Michigan Health System, Women’s Hospital, Ann Arbor, Michigan. jmmhyre@umich.edu

References

To the Editor:—In a recent editorial, Pinsky elaborated on the use of the plethysmographic recording obtained from a pulse oximeter in assessing volume responsiveness before instituting volume resuscitation. Pinsky noted that the plethysmographic signal is dependent on the density of tissue and pulsatile blood in the pathway of the infrared and red wavelengths and that this "... will be a function of both perfusion pressure and vasomotor tone. As upstream vasomotor tone increases, for example, pulse oximeter plethysmographic changes would decrease for the same pulse pressure, and vice versa with vasodilation." The question is, however, whether it is the density or the variation in density that defines the plethysmographic variability.

I have for a couple of years routinely monitored pulse oximetry and plethysmography (Datex-GE, Helsinki, Finland) bilaterally in the lower extremities during abdominal aortic aneurysm repair and unilaterally in peripheral vascular reconstructive surgery. The plethysmographic signal is the first and failsafe herald of peripheral perfusion, and the lack of it likewise immediately warns of thromboembolic complications after declamping.

During one such procedure involving popliteal artery reconstruction under general anesthesia and spontaneous ventilation using a laryngeal mask, the plethysmographic signal after declamping is shown in figure 1, with the insert showing highly irregular beat-to-beat variation in amplitude.

The variation corresponds to variation in amplitude seen in the arterial pressure recording of the radial artery. The ‘silent’ period at approximately 150 s represents manual compression of vascular graft. A perivascular Doppler flow probe was attached to the graft measuring a flow of 100 ml/min. The surgeon decided to assess the flow reserve of the receiving vascular bed, and papaverine 40 mg was injected intraproximally sequentially to the graft. The Doppler signal instantaneously increased to 200 ml/min, and the ensuing plethysmographic recording is shown in figure 2. The plethysmogram was all but abolished in response to the injection of papaverine. The arterial pressure remained largely unaffected by the peripheral vasodilation.

Initially, the response baffled me as I was expecting an increase with vasodilation, as stated by Pinsky. On second thought, the explanation became evident: the plethysmographic signal in Datex-GE pulse oximeters is highpass filtered, which resets the oscillations to vary between

The above letter was sent to the authors of the referenced report. The authors did not feel that a response was required.—James C. Eisenach, M.D., Editor-in-Chief.

Surprises in Plethysmography

Fig. 1. Registration of plethysmographic signal shortly after declamping of graft. “Silent” period at 150 s represents manual compression of graft. Insert demonstrates the initial highly irregular plethysmographic signal from the reperfused extremity.

Copyright © 2007, the American Society of Anesthesiologists, Inc. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Inc.
To the Editor— I read with interest Wrobel and Ziegeler’s article¹ that airway obstruction occurred during the use of a reusable laryngeal mask airway classic (LMA-Classic; The Laryngeal Mask Company, Henley-on-Thames, United Kingdom). In their report, a clear airway was obtained after insertion of a size 4 LMA-Classic and after inflation of the cuff with 20 ml air. During anesthesia, 10 ml air was added to the cuff to prevent airleak around the device, but the airway was obstructed. Close examination of the device after its removal showed that there was a cuff herniation that had not been detected at preuse checking.

In a previous study,² which Wrobel and Ziegeler did not mention in their report, I showed that cuff herniation of the LMA-Classic may not be apparent if the cuff is inflated with the volume less than the recommended maximal volume (e.g., 30 ml for size 4) but may only become apparent when inflated with a volume of air 50% greater (45 ml). I also reported that if the cuff is inflated with a smaller volume of air (e.g., 20 ml), there may be a dimple in the herniated part of the cuff, suggesting that there is a weakness of the cuff.² Wrobel and Ziegeler¹ stated that there was no problem at preuse checking, but the cuff was checked by inflating it with 20 ml air (Marc Wrobel, M.D., Department for Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, University of Saarland, Homberg/Saar, Germany; personal written communication, 2007). In figure 1 of their report,¹ cuff herniation was apparent when the cuff was inflated with 40 ml air (Marc Wrobel, M.D., Department for Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, University of Saarland, Homberg/Saar, Germany, personal written communication, 2007), and when the cuff was inflated with smaller volume of air (fig. 2 of their report), there was a dimple in the herniated part of the cuff.¹ These features are strikingly similar to results obtained in my previous article.² Therefore, if the integrity of the cuff had been checked by inflating the cuff with 45 ml air in their case, airway obstruction resulting from the damaged LMA-Classic might have been avoided.

Wrobel and Ziegeler suggested that the use of a silicone lubricant may damage the cuff.¹ I pointed out that sterilization of the device in an autoclave with the cuff not tightly deflated or before any fluid has been infused into the cuff may also damage the cuff.² Any reusable device, particularly a well-used one, should undergo a proper preuse checking, and I suggest the following.

1. Before each use, the absence of cuff herniation (and any other deformities) should be confirmed by inflating the cuff with a volume of air 50% greater than the recommended maximal volume. This practice is now recommended by the manufacturer.
2. Before use, the absence of dimple in the cuff should be confirmed by inflating the cuff with 15-20 ml air.
3. After insertion of the LMA-Classic, the cuff should be inflated with approximately 15 ml air,² and if airleak occurs around the cuff, air may be added until the cuff volume reaches the recommended maximal value.
4. If there is still airleak, the device should be removed, and a larger one should be used. The integrity of the removed device should be rechecked.

Takashi Asai, M.D., Ph.D., Kansai Medical University, Osaka, Japan. asai@takii.kmu.ac.jp
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To the Editor—Fiberoptic intubation is a very useful technique for patients whose tracheas are difficult to intubate using conventional methods. However, insertion of a fiberscope and insertion of an endotracheal tube over the fiberscope into the trachea are two major difficulties. We encountered an unusual difficulty during removal of the fiberscope after successful tracheal intubation. Our search revealed no such difficulty reported in the literature.

A 30-yr-old man with atlanto-axial dislocation came for trans-oral decompression and posterior fixation. An awake intubation was planned. After adequate oral and intravenous sedation, bilateral superior laryngeal nerve blocks, and topical anesthesia to the airway, a bite block was inserted.

Endotracheal tube (8.5, polyvinyl chloride) was loaded over the fiberscope (Fujinon F B 120-p, Fujinon Corporation, Saitoma, Japan). A long catheter (drug spray cannula) was inserted through forceps port of the fiberscope for the administration of local anesthesia in the event of inadequate anesthesia. This catheter comes with a fiberscope set.

The fiberscope and endotracheal tube were inserted through the mouth. Excellent local anesthesia was observed while introducing the fiberscope and the tube into the trachea, which was performed within 30–40 s. The patient remained comfortable during and after intubation of the endotracheal tube without any sign of distress. Administration of local anesthesia was not required. With successful intubation, we tried to remove the fiberscope. Initially we felt some resistance. After applying slight force, the fiberscope came out but the injection catheter remained inside the tube. We were unable to remove the catheter with moderate force. To determine the reason, we reinserted the fiberscope into the trachea over the catheter. We noticed that the catheter had gone beyond the tip of the endotracheal tube, making a U shape over the edge of it. We removed the tube along with the fiberscope and the catheter. The catheter was not used during the second attempt of awake fiberoptic intubation, which was accomplished without difficulty. Subsequent endoscopic examination of the distal trachea and major bronchi revealed normal anatomy.

We hypothesized that during advancement of the endotracheal tube over the fiberscope, the injecting catheter migrated beyond the tip of the fiberscope. With further advancement, it became U shaped over the edge of the tube, and one arm of it got trapped between the tube and the trachea, which caused it to be stalked within the tube (figure 1).

Inadvertent advancement of the tip of the fiberscope through a side hole (Murphy eye) of an endotracheal tube, causing difficulty in intubation has been reported.

To eliminate this kind of problem with the use of an injection catheter, we suggest a simple measure. The catheter should be fixed with adhesive tape or a rubber band at the inlet of the forceps port so that it will not protrude from the tip of fiberscope in situ.

Prabhakar Suman Prakash, M.D., Mihir Prakash Pandia, M.D.*
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