



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Reply letter to: Intubation in neonatal resuscitation - compelling necessity or incalculable risk?

Roehr, C.C.; Madar, J.; Morley, C.J.; Ainsworth, S.; Ersdal, H.; Rudiger, M.; ... ; Wyllie, J.P.

Citation

Roehr, C. C., Madar, J., Morley, C. J., Ainsworth, S., Ersdal, H., Rudiger, M., ... Wyllie, J. P. (2021). Reply letter to: Intubation in neonatal resuscitation - compelling necessity or incalculable risk?, 165, 190-191. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2021.05.022

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3277480>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

Resuscitation

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/resuscitation

Letter to the Editor

Reply letter to: Intubation in neonatal resuscitation — Compelling necessity or incalculable risk?



To the Editor,

Schwindt et al., raise concerns about a passage in the algorithm of the latest European Resuscitation Council (ERC) newborn life support (NLS) guidance. The authors are worried that the ERC-NLS recommendation to “*Consider intubation if not done already (or laryngeal mask if intubation not possible)*” may be interpreted as an imperative to intubate when commencing chest compressions (CC). They speculate this would delay delivering effective ventilation and ongoing management and put patients at risk. We disagree with their interpretation and the ERC-NLS group unanimously refutes the notion that the guideline mandates intubation when commencing CC. It asks those involved to think about whether intubation or a laryngeal mask (LM) might be beneficial at this time, bearing in mind that babies who receive CC will have received mask ventilation that may already have been suboptimal and is then potentially further compromised by the delivery of CC.^{1,2} Therefore, the ERC-NLS writing group concluded that a secure airway was optimal and that if intubation (or insertion of LM) could be undertaken competently and safely, then it should be considered. The ERC-NLS guidelines are not prescriptive and individual teams should choose the most effective means of airway management according to the locally available skills and facilities, be it face mask, LM, or intubation.

We appreciate the efforts of Schwindt et al., in aiming to improve newborn resuscitation guidelines by basing them on evidence. However, it needs to be acknowledged that studying newborn resuscitation with CC is very challenging as cases are infrequent, heterogenous and difficult to anticipate, meaning solid evidence is scarce and no good studies exist on the optimal management of newborns receiving CPR. With respect to the effectiveness of invasive versus non-invasive airway management, the ERC-NLS group recognises the few in-vivo observations and the many in-vitro studies which highlight a plethora of problems of facemask ventilation, like mask leak and airway obstruction, and the fact that during mask ventilation, resuscitators are neither able to accurately assess effective ventilation nor heart rate.^{3–5} Further, we agree with Schwindt et al., in acknowledging that adequate ventilation, and thus oxygenation, needs to take precedence over all other resuscitative measures in the majority of those requiring CPR. With respect to the questions Schwindt et al. ask, we consider questions one, two and four as highly-challenging to answer with clinical studies. Question three might be interpreted as suggesting that the ERC-NLS guideline prioritises intubation (or LM) over other tasks. That is incorrect: The

‘consider’ makes no judgements on priorities but is to ensure that the effectiveness of airway management remains a priority during the delivery of CC — rather than making a potentially invalid assumption on the effectiveness of mask ventilation and continuing with vascular access and drugs inappropriately.

In the absence of evidence suggesting non-invasive airway support is superior to invasive support during CPR with CC, and evidence to suggest mask ventilation is commonly poorly performed, we remain with our recommendation to *consider* intubation or LM airways to secure the airway when faced with ongoing CPR.

Financial disclosure

None of the authors has financial relationships relevant to this review.

Conflict of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest relevant to this review.

Contributors’ statement

All authors contributed to writing of this letter.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to acknowledge the collaboration with the following authors:

ERC-NLS 2021 writing group:

Sean Ainsworth^f, Hege Ersdal^{g,h}, Mario Rüdiger^{i,j}, Christiane Skåre^k, Tomasz Szczapa^l, Arjan te Pas^m, Daniele Trevisanutoⁿ, Berndt Urlesberger^o, Dominic Wilkinson^{p,q,r}, Jonathan P. Wyllie^s

Collaborators affiliations:

^fDirectorate of Women’s and Children’s Services, Victoria Hospital, Kirkcaldy, UK

^gDepartment of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, Stavanger University Hospital, Stavanger, Norway

^hFaculty of Health Sciences, University of Stavanger, Stavanger, Norway

ⁱDepartment for Neonatology and Pediatric Intensive Care Medicine, Clinic for Pediatrics, University Hospital C.G. Carus, Technische Universität Dresden, Germany

^jCenter for Feto-Neonatal Health, Technische Universität Dresden, Germany

^kDepartment of Anaesthesiology, Oslo University Hospital, Norway

^lDepartment of Neonatology, Neonatal Biophysical Monitoring and Cardiopulmonary Therapies Research Unit, Poznan University of Medical Sciences, Poznan, Poland

^mDepartment of Paediatrics, Division of Neonatology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

ⁿDepartment of Woman's and Child's Health, University Hospital of Padova, Padova, Italy

^oDivision of Neonatology, Medical University Graz, Austria

^pOxford Uehiro Centre for Practical Ethics, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Oxford, UK

^qNewborn Services, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford University Hospitals, Oxford, UK

^rMurdoch Children's Research Institute, Melbourne, Australia

^sJames Cook University Hospital, Middlesbrough, UK.

Charles C. Roehr^{a,b,*}

^aNewborn Services, Southmead Hospital, North Bristol Trust, Bristol BS10 5NB, UK

^bNuffield Department of Population Health, National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit, Medical Sciences Division, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

John Madar

Department of Neonatology, University Hospitals Plymouth, Plymouth, UK

Colin J. Morley^{a,b}

^aUniversity of Melbourne, Australia

^bDepartment of Obstetrics, University of Cambridge, UK

Sean Ainsworth

Hege Ersdal

Mario Rüdiger

Christiane Skåre

Tomasz Szczapa

Arjan te Pas

Daniele Trevisanuto

Berndt Urlesberger

Dominic Wilkinson

Jonathan P. Wyllie

* Corresponding author at: Neonatal Unit, Southmead Hospital, North Bristol Trust, Bristol BS10 5NB, UK.

E-mail address: charles.roehr@bristol.ac.uk (C. Roehr).

Received 23 May 2021

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2021.05.022>

© 2021 Published by Elsevier B.V.

REFERENCES

1. Huynh T, Hemway RJ, Perlman JM. Assessment of effective face mask ventilation is compromised during synchronised chest compressions. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal* Ed 2015;100:F39–42.
2. Boldingh AM, Skåre C, Nakstad B, Solevåg AL. Suboptimal heart rate assessment and airway management in infants receiving delivery room chest compressions: a quality assurance project. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal* Ed 2020;105:545–9.
3. Schilleman K, van der Pot CJ, Hooper SB, Lopriore E, Walther FJ, te Pas AB. Evaluating manual inflations and breathing during mask ventilation in preterm infants at birth. *J Pediatr* 2013;162:457–63.
4. Poulton DA, Schmölzer GM, Morley CJ, Davis PG. Assessment of chest rise during mask ventilation of preterm infants in the delivery room. *Resuscitation* 2010;82:175–9.
5. Yamada NK, Yaeger KA, Halamek LP. Analysis and classification of errors made by teams during neonatal resuscitation. *Resuscitation* 2015;96:109–13.