

## Original Research Article

# Performance of McGrath Mac Video Laryngoscopy by Anesthesia Residents in Patients with a Potentially Difficult Airway

Dr. P. Ramesh Kumar<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Manjeeth Kumar<sup>2\*</sup>, Dr. S. Sathya Suganya<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>MD, DA, Assistant Professor, Anaesthesiology Department, Government Mohan Kumaramangalam Medical College, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India

<sup>2</sup>MD Anesthesia Resident, Government Mohan Kumaramangalam Medical College, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India

### Article History

Received: 05.11.2020

Accepted: 18.12.2020

Published: 30.12.2020

### Journal homepage:

<https://www.easpublisher.com>

### Quick Response Code



**Abstract:** McGrath Mac Video laryngoscopy is a very useful device in the management of difficult airway. Since the blade is of much familiar Macintosh type, learning to use McGrath Mac Video laryngoscopy is easier. This device has been experimented both in experienced anaesthesia providers and in novices, in terms of first attempt success rate of tracheal intubation, ease of visualisation of glottis and intubation. In our clinical research, we studied how well the anaesthesia residents can use the McGrath Mac Video laryngoscope in patients with predictors of difficult airway. The Mean±SD time to laryngoscopy 22.34±4.87 seconds in Macintosh group Vs 38.83±4.96 seconds in McGrath group, whereas for intubation 29.1±6.47 seconds in Macintosh group Vs 57.97±9.54 seconds in McGrath group. We concluded that the time to laryngoscopy and tracheal intubation is statistically longer with McGrath Mac Video laryngoscopy as compared to Macintosh direct laryngoscopy. The occurrence of sore throat and airway injury is less with McGrath Mac Video laryngoscopy.

**Keywords:** Difficult airway, McGrath Video laryngoscope, anaesthesia residents.

**Copyright © 2020 The Author(s):** This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

## INTRODUCTION

McGrath Mac video laryngoscope provides an enhanced view of glottis and is a useful tool while intubating a difficult airway. Because of its similarity with the much familiar Macintosh blade, learning to use McGrath Mac video laryngoscope is easier.

We hypothesised that anaesthesia providers with limited experience in McGrath MAC video laryngoscope can successfully use it in patients with anticipated difficult airway to improve first attempt success rate.

This study was designed to compare Macintosh laryngoscopy and McGrath video laryngoscopy performed by anaesthesiology residents, for the first attempt intubation of a difficult airway.

## METHODOLOGY

The study was designed to be a prospective, randomized, controlled, and patient blinded study. Institutional Ethical Committee approval was obtained for conducting this research work. Participants of this study were the consented patients scheduled for elective surgery under general anaesthesia at Government Mohan Kumaramangalam Medical College and

Hospital, Salem during the period of January 2018 to August 2019.

Anaesthesia providers who participated in the study were anaesthesiology residents, under the supervision of qualified experienced anaesthesiologists. All the anaesthesia residents who participated in this study received an introduction and demonstration of McGrath MAC video laryngoscope and were trained on adult intubating mannequin. All of them had performed at least 50 successful airway intubations with conventional laryngoscope and had the minimum of one year experience in handling direct laryngoscope. Caregivers could not be blinded to the intervention.

Sample size was calculated based on results from pilot study conducted on ten consented patients. The total sample size needed was fifty-eight (N=58), for the power of the study to be 90%.

The study participants were randomly allocated to one of two groups (n=29 for each group namely, group Macintosh (DL), and group McGrath (IDL) by drawing sequentially numbered sealed opaque envelopes that contained a computer randomization code with 1:1 allocation ratio before general anaesthesia.

**Group-DL:** Intubation has done using direct laryngoscopy with Macintosh blade.

**Group-IDL:** Intubation has done using indirect video laryngoscopy with the McGrath MAC blade.

**Inclusion Criteria**

Patients undergoing elective surgery under GA with the orotracheal tube, aged 18-65 years of both gender, with American Society of Anaesthesiologists physical status class I-II who had any one of the following predictors of airway difficulty like 1) Modified Mallampati class 3 or more, 2) Thyromental distance less than 6 cm, 3) Limited neck extension, and 4) BMI- 30kg/m2 or more.

**Exclusion Criteria**

Patients with American Society of Anaesthesiologists physical status class III and above, emergency surgeries, inter-incisor distance less than 3cm, pregnancy, and with risk of gastric regurgitation.

**Assessment and Preparation**

All patients were assessed in pre-assessment clinic by either anaesthesia residents or experienced anaesthesiologists well before surgery. Careful history taking, general and systemic examinations as well as investigations were done to rule out any severe comorbidity. BMI calculations were made. A meticulous airway assessment was done to find out the patients with difficult airway by giving main attention to airway indices Modified Mallampati airway classification, Neck movements and Thyromental distance.

**Blinding and Masking**

The patient remained blinded about the laryngoscopic technique until the postoperative follow up. The study team and the anaesthesia team came to know about the choice of laryngoscope just prior to premedication. The McGrath MAC Video laryngoscope, blade no 3, 4, adult malleable stylet and McIntosh Laryngoscope were made available at the operating room where the study was conducted. An independent observer (not the anaesthesia provider) will note the time for glottis visualization and intubation, along with hemodynamic response at various intervals.

**Anaesthesia Provider**

Definition of limited experience with McGrath MAC video laryngoscope was “the anesthesia resident who had attended a lecture and demonstration of

McGrath MAC video laryngoscopy on manikin, Intubated Manikin (Laerdal intubation trainer) three times using McGrath MAC video laryngoscope and intubated two consented patients with no validated predictors of difficult airway under the supervision of an experienced anaesthesia provider.

The primary outcome of the study was the time to Laryngoscopy and intubation.

The secondary outcomes were Likert scale for ease of intubation, and sore throat.

Hemodynamic changes during intubation and the complications of laryngoscopy and intubation such as bleeding, injuries and sore throat are observed and analysed.

**Statistical Methods**

Time to Laryngoscopy and intubation were considered as primary outcome variables. Likert scale, sore throat was considered as secondary outcome variables. Study group (Direct laryngoscopy Vs In Direct laryngoscopy) was considered as Primary explanatory variable.

For normally distributed Quantitative parameters the mean values were compared between study groups using independent sample t-test (2 groups).

Categorical outcomes were compared between study groups using Chi square test /Fisher's Exact test (If the overall sample size was < 20 or if the expected number in any one of the cells is < 5, Fisher's exact test was used).

P value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. IBM SPSS version 22 was used for statistical analysis.

Both the groups were comparable in terms of gender distribution, and anthropometric measures, with the difference being statistically insignificant (p-value >0.05).

The Mallampati score of the participants between the two groups were comparable, with the difference being statistically insignificant (p-value >0.05).

**Table 1: Comparison of modified Mallampati score between group (N=58)**

| Modified Mallampati Score | Group                      |                               | Chi square | P value |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---------|
|                           | Direct Laryngoscopy (N=29) | In Direct Laryngoscopy (N=29) |            |         |
| 1                         | 8 (27.59%)                 | 7 (24.14%)                    | 0.337      | 0.953   |
| 2                         | 8 (27.59%)                 | 10 (34.48%)                   |            |         |
| 3                         | 11 (37.93%)                | 10 (34.48%)                   |            |         |
| 4                         | 2 (6.9%)                   | 2 (6.9%)                      |            |         |

The mean of Time to Laryngoscopy in seconds was  $22.34 \pm 4.84$  in Direct Laryngoscopy group, it was  $38.83 \pm 4.96$  in In Direct Laryngoscopy group, and the mean difference (16.48) between two groups was statistically significant. (p value  $<0.05$ ). The mean of

Time to Intubation in seconds was  $29.1 \pm 6.47$  in Direct Laryngoscopy group, it was  $57.97 \pm 9.54$  in In Direct Laryngoscopy group, and the mean difference (28.86) between two groups was statistically significant (p value  $<0.05$ ).

**Table 2: Comparison of mean of parameter between study group (N=58)**

| Parameter                              | (Mean± SD)       | Mean difference | 95% CI |       | P value  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|--------|-------|----------|
|  |                  |                 | Lower  | Upper |          |
| <b>Time to Laryngoscopy in seconds</b> |                  |                 |        |       |          |
| Direct Laryngoscopy                    | $22.34 \pm 4.84$ | 16.48           | 13.90  | 19.06 | $<0.001$ |
| In Direct Laryngoscopy                 | $38.83 \pm 4.96$ |                 |        |       |          |
| <b>Time to Intubation in seconds</b>   |                  |                 |        |       |          |
| Direct Laryngoscopy                    | $29.1 \pm 6.47$  | 28.86           | 24.57  | 33.15 | $<0.001$ |
| In Direct Laryngoscopy                 | $57.97 \pm 9.54$ |                 |        |       |          |

One out of 29 patients in direct laryngoscopy had blood staining on blade, and esophageal intubation. Three out of 29 patients in direct laryngoscopy had sore throat. None of the 29 patients in indirect laryngoscopy had blood staining on blade, sore throat, or esophageal intubation. The difference in heart rate, blood pressure between the two groups was statistically insignificant.

## DISCUSSION

The McGrath MAC Video laryngoscope manufactured by Aircraft Medical, Edinburgh, United Kingdom is a handy Video laryngoscope that consists of a handle with battery inside, a steel blade core called Camera Stick, and a LCD monitor (2.5 inch size) fixed to the handle. The lithium-ion battery pack in McGrath MAC provides approximately 250 minutes of power for use. The McGrath MAC VL is fully immersible for high-level disinfection. The McGrath MAC does not have any connection port to external monitor to transfer the images.

McGrath MAC video laryngoscopes are provided with McIntosh blades of size 3 and 4. These blades are not hyper angulated blades as seen with McGrath Series 5. As McGrath MAC video laryngoscope have Mcintosh blades, can be used both for direct and indirect video laryngoscopy.

Mulcaster et al., reported that novices performing direct laryngoscopy with Macintosh blade requires a median of 47 uses before achieving a success rate of 90%. They also found that median of 35 trails of intubation may result in the success rate of 80%.

Savoldelli et al. conducted a manikin study to compare the learning curve and efficacy of various indirect laryngoscopes (Glidescope, McGrath video laryngoscopes and Airtraq optical laryngoscope) and Macintosh laryngoscope. Sixty anaesthesia providers were asked to intubate the manikin swiftly five times in a row with each laryngoscope. There is no difference in time take to visualise the vocal cords at the fifth attempt

among the four laryngoscopes. However, ETT manipulation to intubation is shorter with Macintosh laryngoscope than other laryngoscopes. Indirect laryngoscopes provided the better laryngeal view and less dental trauma than Macintosh laryngoscope.

## CONCLUSION

In our study the time for laryngoscopy and tracheal intubation were longer in McGrath video laryngoscope than in Macintosh direct laryngoscope. The complications like airway injury and sore throat were less with McGrath video laryngoscope.

## REFERENCES

- Adnet, F., Borron, S. W., Dumas, J. L., Lapostolle, F., Cupa, M., & Lapandry, C. (2001). Study of the “sniffing position” by magnetic resonance imaging. *The Journal of the American Society of Anesthesiologists*, 94(1), 83-86.
- Bakshi, S. G., Gawri, A., & Divatia, J. V. (2019). McGrath MAC video laryngoscope versus direct laryngoscopy for the placement of double-lumen tubes: A randomised control trial. *Indian journal of anaesthesia*, 63(6), 456-61.
- Chan, H. K. W., Wong, O. F., & Kwan, G. W. M. (2015). A manikin study comparing McGrath Mac® and Airtraq® with Macintosh laryngoscope in tracheal intubation by intensive care unit doctors. *Hong Kong Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 22(6), 337-344.
- Cook, T. M. (2000). A new practical classification of laryngeal view. *Anaesthesia*, 55(3), 274-279.
- Cormack, R. S., & Lehane, J. (1984). Difficult tracheal intubation in obstetrics. *Anaesthesia*, 39(11), 1105-1111.
- El-Ganzouri, A. R., McCarthy, R. J., Tuman, K. J., Tanck, E. N., & Ivankovich, A. D. (1996). Preoperative airway assessment: predictive value of a multivariate risk index. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 82(6), 1197-1204.

- Konrad, C., Schupfer, G., Wietlisbach, M., & Gerber, H. (1998). Learning manual skills in anesthesiology: is there a recommended number of cases for anesthetic procedures?. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 86(3), 635-639.
- Levitan, R. M. (1996). A new tool for teaching and supervising direct laryngoscopy. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 3(1), 79-81.
- Mallampati, S. R., Gatt, S. P., Gugino, L. D., Desai, S. P., Waraksa, B., Freiburger, D., & Liu, P. L. (1985). A clinical sign to predict difficult tracheal intubation; a prospective study. *Canadian Anaesthetists' Society Journal*, 32, 429-434.
- Mulcaster, J. T., Mills, J., Hung, O. R., MacQuarrie, K., Law, J. A., Pytko, S., ... & Field, C. (2003). Laryngoscopic intubation: learning and performance. *The Journal of the American Society of Anesthesiologists*, 98(1), 23-27.
- Noppens, R. R., Möbus, S., Heid, F., Schmidtman, I., Werner, C., & Piepho, T. (2010). Evaluation of the McGrath® Series 5 videolaryngoscope after failed direct laryngoscopy. *Anaesthesia*, 65(7), 716-720.
- Park, S. O., Kim, J. W., Na, J. H., Lee, K. H., Lee, K. R., Hong, D. Y., & Baek, K. J. (2015). Video laryngoscopy improves the first-attempt success in endotracheal intubation during cardiopulmonary resuscitation among novice physicians. *Resuscitation*, 89, 188-194.
- Rombey, T., Schieren, M., & Pieper, D. (2018). Video versus direct laryngoscopy for inpatient emergency intubation in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Deutsches Ärzteblatt International*, 115(26), 437-44.
- Sakles, J. C., Chiu, S., Mosier, J., Walker, C., & Stolz, U. (2013). The importance of first pass success when performing orotracheal intubation in the emergency department. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 20(1), 71-78.
- Shulman, G. B., Nordin, N. G., & Connelly, N. R. (2003). Teaching with a video system improves the training period but not subsequent success of tracheal intubation with the Bullard laryngoscope. *The Journal of the American Society of Anesthesiologists*, 98(3), 615-620.
- Taylor, A. M., Peck, M., Launcelott, S., Hung, O. R., Law, J. A., MacQuarrie, K., ... & Ngan, J. (2013). The McGrath® Series 5 videolaryngoscope vs the Macintosh laryngoscope: a randomised, controlled trial in patients with a simulated difficult airway. *Anaesthesia*, 68(2), 142-147.
- Wallace, C. D., Foulds, L. T., McLeod, G. A., Younger, R. A., & McGuire, B. E. (2015). A comparison of the ease of tracheal intubation using a McGrath MAC® laryngoscope and a standard Macintosh laryngoscope. *Anaesthesia*, 70(11), 1281-1285.
- Weiss, M., Schwarz, U., Dillier, C. M., & Gerber, A. C. (2001). Teaching and supervising tracheal intubation in paediatric patients using videolaryngoscopy. *Pediatric Anesthesia*, 11(3), 343-348.
- Wilson, M. E., Spiegelhalter, D., Robertson, J. A., & Lesser, P. (1988). Predicting difficult intubation. *BJA: British Journal of Anaesthesia*, 61(2), 211-216.