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In Reply:—We agree with Dr. Rigg et al. that large multicenter randomized trials are required to address most clinical outcome questions and that selection of “high-risk” patients will improve the power of such studies. We choose to study our peripheral vascular surgery patients because they were considered to be “high risk.” In our study, 85% of the patients were diabetic, 69% had hypertension, and 36% had a history of previous myocardial infarction. In another prospective study conducted at our institution, 100 consecutive diabetic patients scheduled for vascular surgery received thallium imaging studies before surgery. Eighty percent of these patients had thallium defects, with an average of 1.8 reversible defects per patient. We would have had to perform additional preoperative cardiac testing, such as persantine thallium or dobutamine stress echocardiography, on all enrolled patients to select an even higher risk subset, which by itself would have represented a major financial and logistical challenge.

Rigg et al. suggest that a multicenter trial with sufficient power to determine if choice of anesthesia has any influence on cardiac morbidity and mortality in peripheral vascular surgical patients is a “realistic and achievable” goal. We respectfully disagree. First, as discussed previously, it would be difficult to cost-effectively select a substantially higher risk group. Second, there are relatively few centers in the industrialized world that have the volume of high-risk peripheral vascular patients seen at our hospital. Third, if our study could be considered a pilot, it offers little encouragement to those investigators willing to undertake a larger study in hope of demonstrating any differences.

We also would like to correct a statement made by Rigg et al. They stated that postoperative epidural analgesia was not used in our study. As we previously have reported, 40% of the patients in the epidural group had epidural morphine, and there was a trend toward a higher myocardial infarction rate in that subgroup.
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Use of the LMA for Management of Difficult Airway Due to Extensive Facial and Neck Contracture

To the Editor—The laryngeal mask airway (LMA) provides an alternative technique for managing difficult airway scenarios. We would like to report a case of compromised airway resulting from an extensive severe postburn contracture and its subsequent management.

During a medical humanitarian mission to the West Bank of Palestine, a 52-year-old woman, ASA physical status 2, presented with severe extensive neck contracture that affected the neck, the chin, and the lower lip. The contracture was a result of an untreated partial and full-thickness thermal burn because of the ignition of clothing during a house fire. Surgical reconstruction had been scheduled 1 year previously, but the operation was cancelled because of failure of conventionalotracheal intubation. Because of psychological disturbances and apparent limited intelligence, attempts to establish satisfactory rapport with the patient was unsuccessful. Consequently, we did not believe that an awake blind nasotracheal intubation was an option. Also, the retrograde technique (translaryngeal-guided intubation) was not attempted because of anatomic deformity resulting from the extensive neck contracture.

After preoxygenation, anesthesia was induced with propofol and fentanyl, and the lungs were ventilated manually with oxygen and halothane by a size 4 face mask without particular difficulty. Laryngoscopy with a Macintosh laryngoscope (blade 3 and 4) was attempted twice, but the larynx could not be seen. Because the facilities for an alternative intubation (e.g., new laryngoscope blades, illuminating intubating stylets, flexible fiberscope) were not available, a LMA, size...
Use of the Lighted Stylet to Aid Direct Laryngoscopy

Fig. 1. Distal end of endotracheal tube with the lighted stylet passing through the Murphy hole. In this configuration, the handle of the lighted stylet and endotracheal tube can be easily grasped in one hand for insertion into the trachea.

To the Editor:—Recently, several authors have advocated the use of a lighted stylet to facilitate either awake intubation or an unanticipated difficult intubation. During direct laryngoscopy, the lighted stylet can improve the view in the hypopharynx, and transillumination can assist in guiding the endotracheal tube into the trachea.

We have had success in patients with unanticipated difficult intubation with a modification of this technique. Based on a previous report using the LTA kit (Abbott Laboratories, North Chicago, IL), we thread a lighted stylet (TubeStat, Concept, Clearwater, FL) through the Murphy hole of an endotracheal tube (Fig. 1). Using this configuration, the endotracheal tube does not obstruct the view while the end of the lighted stylet is placed in the trachea. Also, traumatic complications may be less likely to occur. The lighted stylet threaded through the Murphy hole is more maneuverable, and the light is not attenuated by the surrounding endotracheal tube. Once the tip of the lighted stylet is placed in the trachea, the endotracheal tube can be threaded down over the tip of the stylet into the trachea. With the stylet passing through the Murphy hole, if difficulty is encountered because of the alignment of the curved (hockey stick) stylet and the trachea, the endotracheal tube can be gently rotated 180° to improve alignment and ease of passage of the endotracheal tube into the trachea.
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