DOI: 10.7176/JMPB

www.iiste.org

### Is Stylet Use During Intubation Associated with Post Intubation Complications

Talha Tariq<sup>1</sup> Syeda Farzana Batool Zaidi<sup>2</sup> Moalla Muzzafar<sup>3</sup> 1.House Officer Nishtar Hospital, Multan 2.Consultant Anaesthetist Ch. Pervaiz Ellahi Institute of Cardiology, Multan 3. Resident Plastic Surgery, Alnoor Hospital, Makkah KSA

### Abstract

**Objective:** The basic objective is to evaluate the impacts of placing stylet during tracheal intubation on the postoperative pharyngeal pain in anesthetized patients. **Methodology:** This randomized control trail was conducted in the department of Anesthesia and ICU, Ch. Pervaiz Ellahi Institute of Cardiology and Nishter Hospital Multan from May 2017 to December 2018. All these patients were divided into two groups group S (stylet group) and group C (control group) by lottery method. All the data was entered and analyzed by the computer software SPSS version 23.2. **Results:** A total number of 100% (n=386) patients were included in this study, both genders. Gender distribution showed that there were more males than females i.e. 56.2% (n=217) and 43.8% (n=169) respectively. The main outcome variables of this study were pharyngeal pain, airway maintenance and sore throat. It was also noted that group (S) showed easy airway maintenance in 95.9% (n=185) patients. It was observed that, in group (S), 63.2% (n=122) patients were complained from sore throat and 67.4% (n=130) were complained about pharyngeal pain. While on the other hand, in group (C), only 8.3% (n=16) patients were complained about sore throat and 11.4% (n=22) were complained about pharyngeal pain **Conclusion:** Use of stylet during endotracheal intubation decreases the incidences multiple attempts and make the airway maintenance easy for the anesthetist but on the other side it have complications like sore throat and post intubation pharyngeal pain than those patients in which stylet was not usede.

Keywords: Pharyngeal pain, Tracheal Intubation, Stylet, Post-operative.

**DOI**: 10.7176/JMPB/53-05

Publication date: March 31st 2019

### Introduction

Tracheal intubation is very well known and useful procedure in the general anesthesia(1). It is usually simply referred as to place the flexible plastic tube into the trachea (windpipe) to maintain the open air passage(2, 3). In 1979 Ketz and Berci(4) used a term optical stylet for a straight and rigid device which is helpful in Endotracheal intubation. This is very helpful in early airway maintenance. Size of stylet always constant and it should be equal to size of minimum endotracheal tube(5).

Stylets are designed to allow oxygen passage, route for drug administration and suction facility because as diameter of stylet increases size of tracheal tube shortens(6). In difficult airways it is very helpfull to reduce number of attempts for intubation and easy airway management(7). Efficacy of styles and anesthetist satisfaction about has been reported in many studies, but at the same time it was reported that light obstruction with secretion increase the number attempts. Patients should be asked for coughing and huffing properly in pre intubation time to avoid hurdles due to secretions.

Contrary to this, pharyngeal pain and sore throat are very common and usual complaints of post-intubation. One of the major contributing factors is the tracheal intubation that could cause the pathological changes, trauma and nerve damage of trachea and air passage as well(8). It has following important uses: it guides the tracheal tube directly to the larynx, allows the tracheal tube to pass easily, can be stiffened to help tracheal tube to pass through trachea. Shape of stylet can be modified to facilitate the tracheal intubation(9).

In a study Nobuyasu et al (10) suggested that the stylet use in the tracheal intubation is very contributing in the post-operative pharyngeal pain. According to this, there was significantly. Raised post-operative pharyngeal pain in the stylet group (10/20 patients) than in the control group (2/20 patients) (P = 0.013). Similarly most of the previous studies are not in favor of stylet use during the endotracheal intubation but many previous studies also suggest the use of stylet.

Few studies have been conducted on this topic before and almost all were on a small sample size. Another gap in previous studies is that they were conducted on single aspect of device benefits or or complication. But in our study we evaluate both aspect and our study was on a large sample size.

### Methodology

This randomized control (RCT) was conducted in the the department of Anesthesia and ICU, Ch. Pervaiz Ellahi Institute of Cardiology and Nishter Hospital Multan from May 2017 to December 2018. After taking the



ethical approval from the institutional ethical committee of hospital study was started. Informed consent from the particular subjects was also taken. After this we enrolled total number of 386 (100%) patients. Sample size was calculated from WHO's website sample calculation for two proportions with following figures CI 95%, Power, 80%, P1 50% and P2 6.66 (10). Patients need endotracheal intubation with help of stylet, from age group 15-45 years of both genders were included in the study, while patients with congenital abnormalities, ENT, oral surgery, facial injury, and above, and those in which endotracheal not placed for general anesthesia were excluded from study.

Patient meeting the endotracheal criteria were Intubating with endotracheal tube of standard size calculated 7 ID for females and 7.5 ID for males by anesthesiologist having an experience of at least 5 years. After placement of endotracheal tube to the patient, cuff was inflated with air by auscultating trachea with minimal audible air leak. Standard conducts of anesthesia with monitoring as suggested were observed. After extubation patients were interviewed about their pharyngeal pain and sore throat when gain the orientation and consciousness. Pharyngeal pain was graded as Grade 0 - No pain, Grade 1 - Mild Pain, Grade 2 - Moderate pain, Grade 3 - severe pain as described by the patients.

All variables like, Age, Gender, BMI, easiness in airway maintenance, Pharyngeal pain and sore throat were noted in the Pre- designed Performa and analyzed by using SPSS 23.2 V. Mean + SD calculated for quantitative variables and frequency percentages for qualitative variables. P value 0.05 was considered as significant.

#### Results

A total number of 100% (n=386) patients were included in this study, both genders. Gender distribution showed that there were more males than females i.e. 56.2% (n=217) and 43.8% (n=169) respectively. The mean age and BMI of the patients was  $35.03\pm9.82$  years and  $28.45\pm4.60$  BMI respectively. The distribution of Mallum Patti grades (1-4) showed that 33.4% (n=129) patients had grade 1, 17.1% (n=66) had grade 2, 38.1% (n=147) had grade 3 and only 11.4% (n=44) patients had grade 4.

When patients were categorized into different age and BMI categories, it was noted that majority of patients i.e. 52.3% (n=202) were aged from 15 to 35 years and 47.7% (n=184) were aged from 36 to 63 years. 56% (n=216) patients were BMI from 22 to 28 and 44% (n=170) patients were BMI from 29 to 36 respectively.

These 100% (n=386) patients were divided into 2 groups, 193 in each, i.e. control (C) and stylet (S). The mean age and BMI of the patients of control group was  $35.16\pm9.98$  and  $32.46\pm2.76$  respectively, while the mean age and BMI of the patients of stylet group  $34.91\pm9.69$  and  $24.44\pm1.58$  respectively.

The main outcome variables of this study were pharyngeal pain, airway maintenance and sore throat. It was observed that, in group (S), 63.2% (n=122) patients suffered from sore throat and 67.4% (n=130) suffered from pharyngeal pain. It was also noted that group (S) showed easy airway maintenance in 95.9% (n=185) patients and difficult airway maintenance in 4.1% (n=8). While on the other hand, in group (C), only 8.3% (n=16) patients suffered from sore throat and 11.4% (n=22) suffered from pharyngeal pain. It was also observed that group (C) showed easy airway maintenance in 78.2% (n=151) patients and difficult airway maintenance in 21.8% (n=42) patients.

When Chi-Square was applied to check the association, it was noted that sore throat was significantly associated with stratified age, BMI, Mallum Patti grades and groups with p-values 0.000, 0.000, 0.000 and 0.000 respectively. But it was not associated with gender with p-value 0.344.

Similarly, when Chi-Square was applied to check the association, it was noted that pharyngeal pain was significantly associated with stratified age, BMI, Mallum Patti grades and groups with p-values 0.000, 0.000, 0.000 and 0.000 respectively. But it was not associated with gender with p-value 0.073.

Similarly, when Chi-Square was applied to check the association, it was noted that airway maintenance was significantly associated with stratified age, BMI, Mallum Patti grades and groups with p-values 0.000, 0.000, 0.000 and 0.000 respectively. But it was not associated with gender with p-value 0.735.

Vol.53, 2019



Characteristic	16	Frequ	ency	Perce	ntage (%)	
Condor		Frequency		Tercentage (70)		
Gender	<u> </u>	21	7		56.0	
Male		<u></u>	60		<u>56.2</u> <u>13.8</u>	
Female		38	9 c	1	43.8 100 0	
10tai Stratified Age		30	6		.00.0	
Straumen Age		20	n		57 2	
26 62 years		18	<u>Z</u> <u>A</u>	· · · · · ·	52.5 A7 7	
30-03 years Total		386		1	4/./  ^^ ^	
Stratified BMI			0		.00.0	
22_28		216			56	
29-36		170			44	
Total		38	6	1	00.0	
Mallum Patti Gr	яdes		<u> </u>		.00.0	
Grade 1	18 km c	12	9		33.4	
Grade 2		66	5 5		17.1	
Grade 3		14	7		38.1	
Grade 4		44	<u>,</u> 1		11.4	
Total		38	6	1	00.0	
Descriptive Statis	stics		<u> </u>			
•		Me	an		S.D	
Age in years		35.0	03		9.82	
BMI		28.4	45		4.60	
	Table	2: Mean	±S.D in Gro	ups		
Groups		va	riables		Mean±S.D	
Group (S)		Age	in vears		34.91±9.69	
· <b>,</b> 、 /	F	BMI			24.44±1.58	
Group (C)		Age in years			25 16+9 98	
Group (~)	F	<u> </u>	DMT		27 16+7 76	
	I	BNII Tabla 3:		<u> </u>	)2.70-2.70	
		Dharvng	nel Dain			
Crouns	Ι p <sub>r(</sub>	Fllaryng	rnaryngeai rain			
Crown (S)	1 1 1	oconee	- Frequer	017	Dercent	
Group (s)	Ves	esence	Frequer 130	ncy	Percent 67.4	
	Yes	esence	<b>Frequer</b> 130	ncy	Percent 67.4	
	Yes No		<b>Frequer</b> 130 63		Percent 67.4 32.6	
	Yes No Tot	esence	Frequer           130           63           193		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0	
Group (C)	Yes No Tot Yes	al	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171		Percent 67.4 32.6 <b>100.0</b> 11.4	
Group (C)	Yes No Tot Yes No	al	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6	
Group (C)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot	al	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0	
Group (C)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot	al al Sore t	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0	
Group (C) Group (S)	Yes No Tot Yes No Yes	al al al Sore t	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat           122		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0           63.2	
Group (C) Group (S)	Yes No Tot Yes No Yes No	al Sore t	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat           122           71		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0           63.2           36.8	
Group (C) Group (S)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot	al al Sore t	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat           122           71           193		Percent 67.4 32.6 100.0 11.4 88.6 100.0 63.2 36.8 100.	
Group (C) Group (S) Group (C)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes	al	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat           122           71           193           193           122           71           193           16		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0           63.2           36.8           100.           8.3	
Group (C) Group (S) Group (C)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Yes No	al	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat           122           71           193           16           177		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0           63.2           36.8           100.           8.3           91.7	
Group (C) Group (S) Group (C)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot	al	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat           122           71           193           16           177           193		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0           63.2           36.8           100.           8.3           91.7           100.0	
Group (C) Group (S) Group (C)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot	al al Sore t al al	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat           122           71           193           16           177           193           aintenance		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0           63.2           36.8           100.           8.3           91.7           100.0	
Group (C) Group (S) Group (C) Group (S)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Eas	al al al al al irway Ma	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat           122           71           193           16           177           193           16           177           193           185		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0           63.2           36.8           100.           8.3           91.7           100.0           95.9	
Group (C) Group (S) Group (C) Group (S)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot A Eas	al al al al al irway Ma	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat           122           71           193           16           177           193           16           177           193           185           8		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0           63.2           36.8           100.           8.3           91.7           100.0           95.9           4.1	
Group (C) Group (S) Group (C) Group (S)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Eas Diff	al al al al al irway Ma y ficult	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat           122           71           193           16           177           193           aintenance           185           8           193		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0           63.2           36.8           100.           8.3           91.7           100.0           95.9           4.1           100.0	
Group (C) Group (S) Group (C) Group (S)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Eas Diff Tot Fas	al al al al al irway M: y ficult al	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           :hroat           122           71           193           :hroat           16           177           193           aintenance           185           8           193           151		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0           63.2           36.8           100.           8.3           91.7           100.0           95.9           4.1           100.0           78.2	
Group (C) Group (S) Group (C) Group (S) Group (C)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Eas Diff Tot Eas	al al sore t al al al irway Ma y ficult al	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat           122           71           193           16           177           193           16           177           193           aintenance           185           8           193           151		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0           63.2           36.8           100.           8.3           91.7           100.0           95.9           4.1           100.0           78.2           21.8	
Group (C) Group (S) Group (C) Group (S)	Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Yes No Tot Eas Diff Tot Eas	al           al           s           al           s           al           s           al           s           al           s           ficult           al	Frequer           130           63           193           22           171           193           hroat           122           71           193           16           177           193           aintenance           185           8           193           151           42		Percent           67.4           32.6           100.0           11.4           88.6           100.0           63.2           36.8           100.           8.3           91.7           100.0           95.9           4.1           100.0           78.2           21.8	

### Table- 1 Demographic Variables:(n=386)



		(n = 386)			
Effect Modifiers		Pharyngeal Pain		Total	P-value
		Yes	No		
Stratified Age	15-35 years	127	75	202	0.000
	36-63 years	25	159	184	
Total		152	234	386	
Stratified BMI	22-28 BMI	140	76	216	0.000
	29-36 BMI	12	158	170	
Total		152	234	386	
Gender	Male	94	123	217	0.073
	Female	58	111	169	
Total		152	234	386	
Mallum Patti	1	8	121	129	0.000
grades	2	14	52	66	
	3	25	122	147	
	4	32	12	44	
Total		152	234	386	
Groups	Group (S)	130	63	193	0.000
-	Group (C)	22	171	193	
Total		152	234	386	

# Table No. 4Association of Pharyngeal Pain with Effect Modifiers(n = 386)

## Table No. 5 Association of Sore Throat with Effect Modifiers (n = 386)

		(n - 380)			
Effect Modifiers		Sore Throat		Total	P-value
		Yes	No		
Stratified Age	15-35 years	121	81	202	0.000
	36-63 years	17	167	184	
Total		138	248	386	
Stratified BMI	22-28 BMI	132	84	216	0.000
	29-36 BMI	6	164	170	
Total		138	248	386	
Gender	Male	82	135	217	0.344
	Female	56	113	169	
Total		138	248	386	
Mallum Patti	1	27	105	129	0.000
grades	2	33	33	66	
	3	38	109	147	
	4	40	4	44	
Total		138	248	386	
Groups	Group (S)	121	71	193	0.000
	Group (C)	16	177	193	
Total		138	248	386	



		(n = 386)			
Effect Modifiers		Sore Throat		Total	P-value
		Easy	Difficult		
Stratified Age	15-35 years	197	5	202	0.000
	36-63 years	139	45	184	
Total		336	50	386	
Stratified BMI	22-28 BMI	208	8	216	0.000
	29-36 BMI	128	42	170	
Total		336	50	386	
Gender	Male	190	27	217	0.735
	Female	146	23	169	
Total		336	50	386	
Mallum Patti	1	122	7	129	0.000
grades	2	55	11	66	
	3	133	14	147	
	4	26	18	44	
Total		336	50	386	
Groups	Group (S)	185	8	193	0.000
	Group (C)	151	42	193	
Total		336	50	386	]

### Table No. 6 Association of Airway Maintenance with Effect Modifiers (n = 386)

### Discussion

For last many years, instead of having many side effects on the air passage and tracheal passage but tracheal intubation procedure is still being used separately and with help of stylet as well. Because still the anesthesiologists think it as useful and very helpful but none of any other procedure has not replaced it properly till now(11, 12).

In our study it was noted that group (S) showed easy airway maintenance in 95.9% (n=185) patients and difficult airway maintenance in 4.1% (n=8). In two previous studies 35 patients were intubated, out of these 11 patients were with difficult airway due to anatomical curvature and lot of secretions but they were all intubated successfully, success rate was 100%(13). In another study a special type of stylet named as styletoscope was used and tried on difficult airways. It was reported that 94 % difficult airways were intubated successfully after one attempt and 100% after two attempts. In this study it was also reported that mallampati score have no effect on intubation time and number of attempts (14).

In our study we observed that, in group (S), 63.2% (n=122) patients were complained from sore throat and 67.4% (n=130) were complained about pharyngeal pain. While on the other hand, in group (C), only 8.3% (n=16) patients were complained about sore throat and 11.4% (n=22) were complained about pharyngeal pain. In another study conducted by John C et al (9) on effect of stylet use on successful intubation rate and reported that successful airway management and intubation rate was 82.9% with the use of stylet. But he also evaluated complications of stylet use as oxygen desaturation but he compared two types of stylets not stylet and control group. Results of these studies are comparable with our results.

But the previous study did by Nobuyasu Komasawa et al (10) suggested that the incidence of post-operative pharyngeal pain was raised in the stylet group (10/20 patients) about 50% than in the control group (2/30 patients) about 6.6%. This study shows identical results to our clinical trial.

Similarly, the previous study by El-Boghdadly K et al (15) suggested that sore throat in 50% patients and the hoarseness in 55% patients were observed immediately after the surgery. Both the sore throat and the hoarseness were found even after the use of lidocaine spray. This is also mismatching of our study at all. In another study Salvalaggio et al(16) conducted a study and reported that intubation with the use of stylet have more complication like sore throat and horeness of voice (17). In another study Kitamura T et al(14) reported incidence of sore throat in 28% of patient with the use of stylet minor hoarseness in 25% patients. In some studies conducted by AM Christensen (18), Harding CJ (19), P Herlevsen (20) post intubation sore throat reported from 14.4 to 50% and after insertion of laryngeal mask airway it was 5.8 to 24%.

Some previous studies shows the results of application of lubricant on the endotracheal tube in (20/60) patients, the sore throat and pharyngeal pain were both significantly higher; but in our study we didn't use lubrication for endotracheal tube.



### Conclusion

Use of stylet during endotracheal intubation decreases the incidences multiple attempts and make the airway maintenance easy for the anesthetist but on the other side it have complications like sore throat and post intubation pharyngeal pain than those patients in which stylet was not usede.

### Recommendations

In the spectrum of our clinical trial we are going to suggest using the stylet during every endotracheal intubation procedure for every difficult airway. But it enhances the incidence of the sore throat and pharyngeal pain in post-operative anesthetized patients, so it should be use in limited cases.

Funding Sources: Nil Conflict of interest: Nil

### References

- 1. Knudsen K, Nilsson U, Högman M, Pöder U. Awake intubation creates feelings of being in a vulnerable situation but cared for in safe hands: a qualitative study. BMC anesthesiology. 2016;16(1):71.
- 2. Herskovic JJ. Combined laryngo-tracheal anesthetic and stylet device. Google Patents; 2017.
- 3. Herskovic JJ. Combined laryno-tracheal anesthetic and stylet device. Google Patents; 2016.
- 4. Berci G, Katz R. Optical stylet: an aid to intubation and teaching. Annals of Otology, Rhinology & Laryngology. 1979;88(6):828-31.
- 5. Applebaum E. Laryngeal and tracheal problems in patients with central nervous system and spinal disorders. Otolaryngologic clinics of North America. 1979;12(4):829-35.
- 6. Artime CA, Daily WH. The difficult airway: A practical guide: Oxford University Press; 2013.
- 7. Black AE, Flynn PE, Smith HL, Thomas ML, Wilkinson KA. Development of a guideline for the management of the unanticipated difficult airway in pediatric practice. Pediatric Anesthesia. 2015;25(4):346-62.
- 8. Hagberg C, Georgi R, Krier C. Complications of managing the airway. Best Practice & Research Clinical Anaesthesiology. 2005;19(4):641-59.
- 9. Chuda RM. Intubation device with video and anatomic stylet steering. Google Patents; 2014.
- 10. Komasawa N, Nishihara I, Minami T. Effects of stylet use during tracheal intubation on postoperative pharyngeal pain in anesthetized patients: A prospective randomized controlled trial. Journal of Clinical Anesthesia. 2017;38:68-70.
- 11. Frerk C, Mitchell V, McNarry A, Mendonca C, Bhagrath R, Patel A, et al. Difficult Airway Society 2015 guidelines for management of unanticipated difficult intubation in adults. British journal of anaesthesia. 2015;115(6):827-48.
- 12. Angel LF. Airway assembly for tracheal intubation. Google Patents; 2014.
- 13. Pollack C, Bradley B, Jordon R, Mackin R, editors. clinical trial of a® fiberoptic-enhanced endotracheal tube for intubation, monitoring, tube placement, confirmation and difficult airway management. Annual meeting of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine, Washington DC; 1997.
- 14. Yamada Y, Kitamura T, Du H-L, Hanaoka K. An efficient technique for tracheal intubation using the StyletScope alone. The Journal of the American Society of Anesthesiologists. 2000;92(4):1210-.
- 15. El-Boghdadly K, Bailey C, Wiles M. Postoperative sore throat: a systematic review. Anaesthesia. 2016;71(6):706-17.
- 16. de Oliveira Salvalaggio MF, Rehme R, Fernandez R, Vieira S, Nakashima P. A comparative study between the laryngoscope and lighted stylet in tracheal intubation. Brazilian Journal of Anesthesiology. 2010;60(2):138-43.
- 17. Stone DJ, Stirt JA, Kaplan MJ, Mclean WC. A complication of lightwand-guided nasotracheal intubation. The Journal of the American Society of Anesthesiologists. 1984;61(6):780-.
- 18. Christensen A, Willemoes-Larsen H, Lundby L, Jakobsen K. Postoperative throat complaints after tracheal intubation. British Journal of Anaesthesia. 1994;73(6):786-7.
- 19. Harding C, McVey F. Interview method affects incidence of postoperative sore throat. Anaesthesia. 1987;42(10):1104-7.
- 20. Herlevsen P, Bredahl C, Hindsholm K, Kruhøffer P. Prophylactic laryngo-tracheal aerosolized lidocaine against postoperative sore throat. Acta anaesthesiologica scandinavica. 1992;36(6):505-7.