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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.
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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 thus correspond to a reduction of pressure pushing the diaphragm upward. When we estimated pleural pressure as Ppl = (PEEP + PEEP) × Ew/(El + Ew)5 in the supine and beach chair positions with and without PEEP, and considered changes of IAP due to the beach chair position (∆IAP) to obtain an indicative “push-down pressure” (Ppl + ∆IAP), we found that this was positively correlated with end-expiratory lung volume (R² = 0.857, P < 0.001, m = 0.67, multiple linear regression analysis). We did not measure IAP changes occurring in the extreme Trendelenburg position. However, 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 Ppl) 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.1 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.
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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, 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.,1 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 laryngospasm1 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.1 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 dilemma 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.
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