Rapid sequence intubation in Scottish urban emergency departments


ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Objective: Airway care is the cornerstone of resuscitation. In UK emergency department practice, this care is provided by anaesthetists and emergency physicians. The aim of this study was to determine current practice for rapid sequence intubation (RSI) in a sample of emergency departments in Scotland.

Methods: Two year, multicentre, prospective observational study of endotracheal intubation in the emergency departments of seven Scottish urban teaching hospitals.

Results: 1631 patients underwent an intubation attempt in the emergency department and 735 patients satisfied the criteria for RSI. Emergency physicians intubated 377 patients and anaesthetists intubated 355 patients. There was no difference in median age between the groups but there was a significantly greater proportion of men (73.2% versus 65.3%, p=0.024) andatrauma patients (48.5% versus 37.4%, p=0.003) in the anaesthetic group. Anaesthetists had a higher initial success rate (91.8% versus 83.8%, p=0.001) and achieved more good (Cormack-Lehane Grade I and II) views at laryngoscopy (94.0% versus 89.3%, p=0.039). There was a non-significant trend to more complications in the group of patients intubated by emergency physicians (8.7% versus 12.7%, p=0.104). Emergency physicians intubated a higher proportion of patients with physiological compromise (91.8% versus 86.1%, p=0.027) and a higher proportion of patients within 15 minutes of arrival (32.6% versus 11.3%, p<0.0001).

Conclusion: Anaesthetists achieve more good views at laryngoscopy with higher initial success rates during RSI. Emergency physicians perform RSI on a higher proportion of critically ill patients and a higher proportion of patients within 15 minutes of arrival. Complications may be fewer in the anaesthetists’ group, but this could be related to differences in patient populations. Training issues for RSI and emergency airway care are discussed. Complication rates for both groups are in keeping with previous studies.

Airway management is universally accepted as the cornerstone of effective resuscitation. Indeed, airway management has been said to be “the defining skill of emergency medicine”. In the United Kingdom, definitive airway care for patients brought to the emergency department in cardiac arrest has been provided by emergency physicians for some time.

In many UK hospitals, however, definitive airway management of patients who require anaesthetic drugs and/or neuromuscular blocking agents who permit endotracheal intubation is the responsibility of anaesthetists only. Recent work from the United States has shown the efficacy and safety of emergency airway management, including rapid sequence intubation (RSI), by emergency physicians. Practice has changed in some UK emergency departments recently and it is now generally accepted that emergency airway management in these departments can be a shared responsibility between anaesthetists and emergency physicians. Recently in the UK it has been suggested that prehospital RSI can be safely performed by both anaesthetists and emergency physicians.

RSI is the administration of a potent intravenous induction agent followed immediately by a rapidly acting neuromuscular blocking agent to induce unconsciousness and motor paralysis for tracheal intubation. Its origins lie in emergency anaesthesia, where “rapid sequence induction” is the established technique used to provide ideal intubating conditions for emergency surgery while minimising the risks of pulmonary aspiration. RSI is generally regarded as the method of choice for securing the airway for the majority of patients requiring a definitive airway in the emergency department. There have been no published studies directly comparing the success and complication rates of RSI when performed by anaesthetists compared with emergency physicians in the UK. Complication rates for RSI in previous North American studies have ranged from 3% to 15%, but it is difficult to compare these studies because of differing definitions of complications and differences in study methodology.

The aim of this study was to examine prospectively the current practice of RSI in adults performed by anaesthetists or emergency physicians in Scottish urban emergency departments over a two year period.

METHODS

This was a multicentre, prospective observational study running from 1 January 1999 to 10 January 2001 in seven Scottish urban teaching hospitals. Every patient on whom endotracheal intubation was attempted in the participating emergency departments was eligible for the study. Patients who had been successfully intubated before arrival at hospital by either ambulance paramedics or medical staff were specifically excluded from the study.

A form was completed by the intubating doctor immediately after the intubation attempt wherever possible. Data were collected on patient age and sex; indications for intubation; drugs used to facilitate intubation (if any); number and details of each attempt before successful intubation (including the Cormack-Lehane grade); grade and specialty of intubating doctor; immediate complications and physiological data before and after intubation (within 15 minutes).

Investigators in each centre checked the resuscitation room log books regularly to ensure that all eligible patients had been
RESULTS
A total of 1631 patients met the study entry criteria. Altogether 735 patients fulfilled the criteria for RSI and were therefore eligible for analysis. Table 1 gives patient details for the two groups (anaesthetists and emergency physicians). Table 2 compares the success rates for RSI; grades of laryngoscopy; details of physiological compromise, proportion of patients intubated within 15 minutes of arrival in the emergency department and a summary of the number of patients with immediate complications. Table 3 details the number of immediate complications (not patients) seen in each group. A single surgical airway was required by each specialty for failed intubation after RSI.

There were no significant differences in the pattern of results between those hospitals where emergency physicians regularly intubated and those where they did not. In patients requiring more than one attempt at intubation, the second attempt was usually performed by the same specialty that had initiated the process. However, in 33% (20 of 61) of intubations initiated by emergency physicians, subsequent attempts were performed by anaesthetists and in 7% (2 of 29) of anaesthetist initiated intubations, subsequent attempts were performed by emergency physicians.

It was not possible to accurately identify the exact proportion of forms that were completed retrospectively, but our best estimate is around 90 RSI forms (12%). The majority of these forms were completed within two or three weeks of the RSI occurring.

Physiological compromise was defined as the presence of one or more of the following immediately before any attempt at intubation: systolic blood pressure less than 90 mm Hg; Glasgow Coma Score (GCS) <9; respiratory rate less than 10 per minute or greater than 29 per minute; oxygen saturation <90% (measured by pulse oximetry, regardless of inspired oxygen concentration).

DISCUSSION
This study has shown that, for RSI in the emergency department, anaesthetists have a higher initial intubation success rate and obtain more grade I and II views at laryngoscopy than emergency physicians. This may be attributable to superior technical ability of anaesthetists in optimally positioning patients and use of intubating equipment or because of the more urgent nature of more of the emergency physician intubations. It is probable that the higher initial success rates were a result of the higher number of grade I and II views that they obtained at laryngoscopy. The higher number of grade I and II views is probably due to the more urgent nature of intubation and the longer duration of intubation attempts performed by anaesthetists.

Physiological compromise was identified more frequently in the emergency medicine group, suggesting a higher initial intubation success rate in the anaesthetist group, who obtained better views at laryngoscopy. This was despite a higher proportion of patients in the emergency medicine group requiring more than one attempt at intubation (7% vs 20%) and being patients requiring more urgent intubation (anaesthetists vs emergency physicians). This may be attributed to the anaesthetists’ use of trachea intubating drugs and the use of RSI more frequently in the trauma group after an airway assessment by the anaesthetist.

Excluding the trauma group, there were no significant differences in the proportion of patients requiring more than one attempt at intubation (33% vs 28%) and patients requiring trachea intubating drugs (47% vs 37%) between the two groups. The use of trachea intubating drugs was probably the reason for the higher initial intubation success rate in anaesthetists, who obtained better views at laryngoscopy.

The use of RSI in the trauma group was probably due to the longer period of intubation attempts performed by anaesthetists. This may be attributed to the higher number of grade I and II views that they obtained at laryngoscopy and the longer duration of intubation attempts performed by anaesthetists.

The use of RSI in the trauma group was probably due to the longer period of intubation attempts performed by anaesthetists. This may be attributed to the higher number of grade I and II views that they obtained at laryngoscopy and the longer duration of intubation attempts performed by anaesthetists.

This study has shown that, for RSI in the emergency department, anaesthetists have a higher initial intubation success rate and obtain more grade I and II views at laryngoscopy than emergency physicians. This may be attributable to superior technical ability of anaesthetists in optimally positioning patients and use of intubating equipment or because of the more urgent nature of more of the emergency physician intubations. It is probable that the higher initial success rates were a result of the higher number of grade I and II views that they obtained at laryngoscopy. The higher number of grade I and II views is probably due to the more urgent nature of intubation and the longer duration of intubation attempts performed by anaesthetists.

To our knowledge, this is the first study to evaluate the use of RSI in the emergency department in the UK. It confirms that RSI is widely used in the UK and its use has increased over the past decade. The study also demonstrates that anaesthetists have a higher initial intubation success rate and obtain more grade I and II views at laryngoscopy than emergency physicians. This may be attributable to superior technical ability of anaesthetists in optimally positioning patients and use of intubating equipment or because of the more urgent nature of more of the emergency physician intubations. It is probable that the higher initial success rates were a result of the higher number of grade I and II views that they obtained at laryngoscopy. The higher number of grade I and II views is probably due to the more urgent nature of intubation and the longer duration of intubation attempts performed by anaesthetists.

This study has shown that, for RSI in the emergency department, anaesthetists have a higher initial intubation success rate and obtain more grade I and II views at laryngoscopy than emergency physicians. This may be attributable to superior technical ability of anaesthetists in optimally positioning patients and use of intubating equipment or because of the more urgent nature of more of the emergency physician intubations. It is probable that the higher initial success rates were a result of the higher number of grade I and II views that they obtained at laryngoscopy. The higher number of grade I and II views is probably due to the more urgent nature of intubation and the longer duration of intubation attempts performed by anaesthetists.
success rate is related to the higher proportion of good views obtained at laryngoscopy.

Both anaesthetists and emergency physicians seem to be capable of performing RSI in the emergency department with comparable immediate complication rates. Emergency physicians tended to have a higher proportion of patients who experienced immediate complications compared with anaesthetists. This did not reach statistical significance, but the study is not sufficiently powered to conclude that there is definitely no difference between the groups. The majority of these complications were either recognised oesophageal intubations or hypotensive episodes. The complications overall noted in the study are comparable to another study of intubation in the critically ill. It is apparent from table 1 that emergency physicians and anaesthetists are performing RSI on differing populations of patients and this may affect the immediate complications observed.

This study has also shown that emergency physicians are performing RSI on a higher proportion of patients with physiological compromise and a higher proportion of patients within 15 minutes of arrival in the emergency department. It is probable that these patients are so ill that the emergency physician has considered it necessary to intervene immediately to save life and reduce morbidity. It may also be related to the immediate availability of the emergency physician within the emergency department, while there may also be a variable delay between calling the anaesthetist to the emergency department and their arrival. Nonetheless the results of this study it is clear that trainees in anaesthesia and emergency medicine need to receive adequate training in resuscitation including advanced airway techniques; this has to include RSI and the management of the difficult or failed airway. This may entail experience in the emergency department, intensive care unit and operating theatre for both specialties along with dedicated simulator training.

The lack of internationally accepted definitions of complications of RSI means that studies of emergency airway management (in any setting) cannot be compared on an equivalent basis. Standardised definitions would permit national and international comparisons in the future.

In the UK, there is a role for both emergency physicians and anaesthetists in the management of acute airway compromise in the emergency department. Close collaboration on training and service models and delivery is essential.
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