and during extubation in 35.9%. As these are essential components of anesthesia, the assumption that a tracheal tube is safer than the LMA is open to debate.

The second point is that Dr. Cooper does not distinguish between the cLMA and ProSeal LMA (PLMA). The PLMA is designed to separate the gastrointestinal and respiratory tracts and improve mechanical ventilation. There is increasing evidence these aims are achieved.⁵

Dr. Cooper hopes that evidence of safety will be available from randomized controlled trials (RCT). Detecting a 50% reduction in aspiration between cLMA and PLMA would require approximately 1.3 million patients per group.

Arguments therefore exist that, for laparoscopic surgery, each of the available airways is the best choice. No RCT will adequately inform which is best for a given group of patients. Even if it did this will not ensure that a specific device is the best choice for an individual patient presenting for anesthesia. Anesthesiologists must continue to analyze the currently limited 'best available evidence' and make their own balanced decision.

Tim Cook MBBS (hons) BA (hons) FRCA
Bath, England

References

- 1 Cooper RM. The LMA, laparoscopic surgery and the obese patient – can vs should (Editorial). *Can J Anesth* 2003; 50: 5–10.
- 2 Rose DK, Cohen MM. The airway: problems and predictions in 18,500 patients. *Can J Anaesth* 1994; 41: 372–83.
- 3 Warner MA, Warner ME, Weber JG. Clinical significance of pulmonary aspiration during the perioperative period. *Anesthesiology* 1993; 78: 56–62.
- 4 Sidaras G, Hunter JM. Is it safe to artificially ventilate a paralysed patient through the laryngeal mask? The jury is still out. *Br J Anaesth* 2001; 86: 749–53.
- 5 Cook TM, Nolan JP, Verghese C, et al. Randomized crossover comparison of the proSeal with the classic laryngeal mask airway in unparalysed anaesthetized patients. *Br J Anaesth* 2002; 88: 527–33.

REPLY:

I would like to thank Dr. Cook for his comments on my editorial.¹ Use of a laryngeal mask airway (LMA) may avoid difficult laryngoscopies and failed intubations, but it does not guarantee correct placement, adequate ventilation and a secure airway in every patient. As I stated in my editorial, there is an enormous range in reported LMA-associated complications. Even in the hands of

experts, including Cook et al.,² successful insertion was not possible with the ProSeal laryngeal mask airway (PLMA) in 2/178 patients and required more than one attempt in 20% with the PLMA and 10% with the LMA-Classic. Virtually identical results were obtained by Brimacombe and others.³ Multiple attempts increase the potential of laryngospasm, regurgitation, desaturation, trauma, coughing and hemodynamic disturbances. I suspect that these complications are a part of general anesthesia, whether they involve intubation or LMA insertion. Because of the published range in complication rates, it will be difficult to compare the safety of techniques.

Development of the PLMA was welcomed. Hopefully evidence will continue to mount, supporting its effective separation of the respiratory and alimentary tracts. It can only provide such protection if it is properly inserted and it is imperative that users be fastidious in their insertion, fixation and confirmation techniques. I reported a case of a patient in whom aspiration occurred despite an apparently correctly placed PLMA.⁴

I agree with Dr. Cook that it is unlikely that the comparative safety of intubation vs LMA insertion will be established by randomized controlled trials, but when such trials are performed, we must examine them critically. Can the reader safely adapt the technique into his practice? Will it enhance patient safety? As we continue to apply the technique to higher risk patients (laparoscopy, obesity, gastro-esophageal reflux), we may compromise its impressive safety record.

It is not my intention to argue against the use of LMA devices. My interest is enhancing patient safety, which I believe can best be achieved by a constant striving to improve technique and the appropriate matching of the device to the patient and surgical procedure.

Richard M. Cooper MD FRCPC
Toronto, Ontario

References

- 1 Cooper RM. The LMA, laparoscopic surgery and the obese patient--can vs should (Editorial). *Can J Anesth* 2003; 50: 5–10.
- 2 Cook TM, Nolan JP, Verghese C, et al. Randomized crossover comparison of the proSeal with the classic laryngeal mask airway in unparalysed anaesthetized patients. *Br J Anaesth* 2002; 88: 527–33.
- 3 Brimacombe J, Keller C, Fullekrug B, et al. A multicenter study comparing the ProSeal™ and Classic™ laryngeal mask airway in anesthetized, nonparalyzed patients. *Anesthesiology* 2002; 96: 289–95.
- 4 Cooper RM. Use of a new videolaryngoscope [GlideScope(R)] in the management of a difficult airway. *Can J Anesth* 2003; 50: 611–3.