airway device evaluation project team (ADEPT) guidance on the selection of airway devices. It recommends at least level 3b evidence for airway devices that are used in clinical practice[3].

After approval by the institutional research ethical committee and written informed consent, 58 ASA 1 and 2 adult patients, age >18 yr were enrolled in the study. Randomisation was done using sealed envelope technique and patients were divided into 29 each IRRIS group and control group (non-IRRIS). All patients received TIVA with target-controlled infusion propofol and neuromuscular block with vecuronium bromide. Our primary outcome was total time to pass a fibrescope from the mouth to glottic opening, and the secondary outcomes were the number of manoeuvres such as head tilt, chin lift, jaw thrust, and lingual traction.

The time taken was 30 s to complete the first 25% of the IRRIS patients, compared with more than 40 s for controls. This time difference becomes wider when we reach the 50% completed mark, with 50% of IRRIS patients completed in just under 40 s, against 57 s for the controls. Meanwhile, 75% of IRRIS patients complete in just more than 50 s, whereas the controls take 80 s. The time difference to pass the fibrescope through the glottic opening was significant in both groups (P=0.011). Head tilt plus chin lift was the common manoeuvre used in both groups; 20 times in the IRRIS group and 14 times in controls. Head tilt plus chin lift plus jaw thrust was used five times in both groups. In two patients of IRRIS group head tilt plus chin lift plus jaw thrust plus lingual traction was used as compared with a similar number of manoeuvres used six times in controls. We conclude that the IRRIS device can be a great addition for anaesthetists who are less familiar with FOI. We also suggest that, by using the IRRIS device, we can reduce hypoxia time in difficult airway patients with respiratory compromise.

References

1. 4th National Audit Project of The Royal College of Anaesthetists and The Difficult Airway Society. Royal College of Anaesthetists, London, 2011.
2. Kristensen MS, Fried E, Biro P. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand 2017; 62: 19–25
3. Pandit JJ, Popat MT, Cook TM, *et al. Anaesthesia* 2011; **66**: 726–37

Evaluation of the McGrath MAC™ and Macintosh laryngoscope for tracheal intubation

Marc Kriege[1] and Rüdiger R. Noppens[2], for the EMMA trial group

[1]Department of Anesthesiology, University Medical Center of the Johannes Gutenberg-University, Mainz, Germany and [2]Department of Anesthesia and Perioperative Medicine, Western University, London, ON, Canada

Direct laryngoscopy (DL) using a Macintosh blade is the first choice for tracheal intubation in many hospitals. The value of videolaryngoscopy using a Macintosh-shaped blade for routine intubation is currently unclear; few RCTs comparing this technique with DL are currently available.[1] We hypothesised that using the McGrath MAC (McG; Medtronic, Dublin, Ireland) for routine intubation in the operating room results in a higher first-pass intubation success rate (FPS) compared with conventional DL.

This trial was a multicentre, open-label, patient-blinded, randomised controlled clinical trial and approved by the ethics committees of participating centres before patient recruitment. Patients who had elective surgery with tracheal intubation were included in this study. Patients were excluded if a difficult intubation was expected, age <18 yr, ASA 4, and a high-risk of aspiration. The primary end point was FPS; the secondary endpoints were the influence of the provider experience, time to intubation, Intubation Difficult Score (IDS >5 points: difficult intubation), and adverse events (e.g., hypoxaemia or soft tissue injury).[1] A χ^2 test was used to compare FPS between the two groups. Data are expressed as median (inter-quartile range [IQR]).

A total of 2171 patients (McG, n=1084; DL, n=1087) were included. FPS was higher with the McG (1019/1084; 94%) compared with DL (896/1087; 82%) (P<0.0001). Time for intubation was significantly shorter with DL (34 s; IQR, 26–45) compared with McG (36 s; IQR, 26–47) (P=0.0005). The IDS was higher (>5) using DL (61/1087; 5.6%) compared with the McG (13/1084; 1.2%) (P<0.0001). There were no significant differences in intubation-associated adverse events between groups (P=0.15).

These results reflect the effectiveness of using videolaryngoscopy as a first choice for routine intubation in a large controlled trial for elective surgery patients with anaesthesiologists at various levels of experience. Intubation time was shorter using direct laryngoscopy; however, we do not consider this to be clinically relevant. Based on these results, videolaryngoscopy using a Macintosh-shaped blade can be recommended as a first choice instrument in elective surgery patients.

References

1. Kriege M, Alflen C, Tzanova I, *et al. BMJ Open* 2017; **7**: e016907

Virtual reality simulation to teach videolaryngoscopy: a preliminary validation study

P. Schoettker[1], A. Potié[1], A. Dzyuba[2], E. Ovcharenko[2], N. De Wydt[3], M. Haan[3] and G. Casso[4]

[1]University Hospital Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland, [2]Lucid Reality Labs, Kiev, Ukraine, [3]Medtronic, Neuhausen am Rheinfall, Switzerland and [4]Department of Cardiac Anesthesia and Intensive Care, Cardiocentro, Lugano, Switzerland

Virtual reality (VR) is a technology increasingly used in the field of medicine to teach specific skills and procedures. It has been shown to improve the learning experience compared with various simulation models for airway management. [1–3] Videolaryngoscopy (VL) requires specific skills and a dedicated understanding of the patient airway and equipment. Type of blade, tracheal tube, and need for stylet or bougie have been shown to be an important part of success depending on the clinical situation.

The aim of this study was to report about an innovative airway management VR simulator, which assesses the choice