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ABSTRACT

Background
Emergency intubation has been widely advocated as a life saving procedure in severe acute illness and injury associated with real or potential compromises to the patient's airway and ventilation. However, some initial data have suggested a lack of observed benefit.

Objectives
To determine in acutely ill and injured patients who have real or anticipated problems in maintaining an adequate airway whether emergency endotracheal intubation, as opposed to other airway management techniques, improves the outcome in terms of survival, degree of disability at discharge or length of stay and complications occurring in hospital.

Search strategy
We searched the Cochrane Injuries Group Specialised Register (December 2006), Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) (The Cochrane Library 2006, Issue 4), MEDLINE (1950 to November 2006), EMBASE (1980 to week 50, December 2006), National Research Register (Issue 4, 2006), CINAHL (1980 to December 2006), BIDS (to December 2006) and ICNARC (to December 2006). We also examined reference lists of articles for relevant material and contacted experts in the field. Non-English language publications were searched for and examined.

Selection criteria
All randomised (RCTs) or controlled clinical trials involving the emergency use of endotracheal intubation in the injured or acutely ill patient were examined.

Data collection and analysis
The full texts of 452 studies were reviewed independently by two authors using a standard form. Where the review authors felt a study may be relevant for inclusion in the final review or disagreed, the authors examined the study and a collective decision was made regarding its inclusion or exclusion from the review. The results were not combined in a meta-analysis due to the heterogeneity of patients, practitioners and alternatives to intubation that were used.
Main results

We identified three eligible RCTs carried out in urban environments. Two trials involved adults with non-traumatic out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. One of these trials found a non-significant survival disadvantage in patients randomised to receive a physician-operated intubation versus a combi-tube (RR 0.44, 95% CI 0.09 to 1.99). The second trial detected a non-significant survival disadvantage in patients randomised to paramedic intubation versus an oesophageal gastric airway (RR 0.86, 95% CI 0.39 to 1.90). The third included study was a trial of children requiring airway intervention in the prehospital environment. The results indicated no difference in survival (OR 0.82, 95% CI 0.61 to 1.11) or neurologic outcome (OR 0.87, 95% CI 0.62 to 1.22) between paramedic intubation versus bag-valve-mask ventilation and later hospital intubation by emergency physicians; however, only 42% of the children randomised to paramedic endotracheal intubation actually received it.

Authors’ conclusions

The efficacy of emergency intubation as currently practised has not been rigorously studied. The skill level of the operator may be key in determining efficacy.

In non-traumatic cardiac arrest, it is unlikely that intubation carries the same life saving benefit as early defibrillation and bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR).

In trauma and paediatric patients, the current evidence base provides no imperative to extend the practice of prehospital intubation in urban systems.

It would be ethical and pertinent to initiate a large, high quality randomised trial comparing the efficacy of competently practised emergency intubation with basic bag-valve-mask manoeuvres (BVM) in urban adult out-of-hospital non-traumatic cardiac arrest.

Plain Language Summary

Emergency endotracheal intubation (placing a tube through the mouth and throat into the lungs) may reduce deaths from acute illness and injury, but more research is necessary.

Acute illness and injury are the most common causes of death and disability worldwide in people aged under 50 years. The highest priority in an emergency is to enable a patient to breathe by securing their airway (passage from the nose and mouth into the lungs). Endotracheal intubation is one of various ways to secure the airway. This review found no difference between endotracheal intubation and other airway securing strategies for reducing deaths after acute illness or injury; however, better studies are needed.

Background

Airway control and adequate respiration is a priority in the management of any seriously ill or injured person (Nolan 2005; Rotondo 1993). If either is impaired, then emergency endotracheal intubation may be performed in order to secure the airway or assist with ventilation. There are a large number of reports which suggest that airway obstruction is present in many trauma patients and contributes to both morbidity and mortality (Gentleman 1981; Hussain 1994). Endotracheal intubation has, therefore, increased in both the prehospital and early emergency room phases of any resuscitation attempt (Regel 1995).

The use of early intubation is a practice that has resulted in a reduction in morbidity for some groups of patients, most notably those with moderate to severe head injuries (Gildenberg 1985). In this group of patients the wider use of endotracheal intubation and control of ventilation can reduce the incidence of secondary cerebral insults that contribute significantly to morbidity and mortality (Gentleman 1992). Intubation of the trachea is a procedure that is associated with significant risks, including the dangers of aspiration of gastric contents and blood, unrecognised oesophageal intubation and aggravation of existing traumatic in-
juries such as cervical spine damage. It also usually requires the administration of drugs, which may have a detrimental effect on other organs, for example the heart. Despite these risks the use of endotracheal intubation in the resuscitation of a severely injured patient has been said to have a low morbidity (Rotondo 1993).

Recent data collected from both Europe and the USA, however, suggest that endotracheal intubation may not be universally beneficial in all seriously ill and injured patients. Unadjusted data from Belgium, examining 953 out-of-hospital emergencies, including trauma cases, where individuals received cardiopulmonary resuscitation at the scene, suggests that survival to reach hospital was higher in those who were not intubated before arrival than those who were (89.5% versus 67.6%) (Stamatakis 1995). Evidence from data collected by the United Kingdom Trauma Audit Research Network (UK TARN 1996), when adjusted for Injury Severity Score (Baker 1974) and Revised Trauma Score (Champion 1990), also suggests an association between outcome and emergency intubation. Seriously injured patients with an initial Glasgow Coma Score of eight or less who were intubated prior to arrival at hospital or on arrival to the emergency department had a lower 30-day survival than those who were not intubated (46.6% versus 69.3%).

Much of this data is uncontrolled and may reflect other unconsidered variables, for example the practice of individuals who are not expert in airway management to intubate only certain selected groups of patients. However, there is enough evidence to suggest that a review of the practice of emergency endotracheal intubation in the early phase of a resuscitation attempt is warranted.

OBJECTIVES

To determine in acutely ill or injured patients, who have real or anticipated problems in maintaining an adequate airway, whether endotracheal intubation compared to other airway management methods improves outcome in terms of:

- reduction in hospital mortality or disability on leaving hospital
- reduction in the incidence of the following complications: aspiration pneumonia, multiple organ failure, cervical spine injury, length of hospital stay

Other airway management techniques include bag valve mask ventilation with or without an airway adjunct, combi-tube, oesophageal gastric airway and laryngeal mask.

(The Combi-tube is a double lumen tube with one blind end which functions as an oesophageal obturator airway and the other as a standard cuffed endotracheal tube. It is inserted blindly into the mouth and seals the oral and nasopharyngeal cavities.)

METHODS

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

All randomised trials or controlled trials involving the emergency use of endotracheal intubation in the injured or acutely ill patient.

Types of participants

Patients of any age who were injured or acutely ill for other reasons and presented to a hospital emergency room. Studies involving acute deterioration in adults with longstanding respiratory disease were excluded as these have already been the subject of a Cochrane review (Ram 2004).

Types of interventions

Intubation was defined as endotracheal intubation of the patient in the prehospital or emergency department setting. Intubation can be performed for the following reasons:

- securing the patient's airway
- control of ventilation
- to optimise therapy and minimise the effects of secondary brain injury in individuals with a head injury and a Glasgow Coma Score of eight or less
- to prevent combative behaviour and facilitate further examination.

It did not include endotracheal intubation performed to facilitate emergency surgery.

Endotracheal intubation may or may not have been accompanied by prior administration of anaesthetic, sedative or paralysing agents; and may or may not have been succeeded by positive pressure ventilation.

Types of outcome measures

Primary outcomes

- all-cause mortality, namely death either before arrival to hospital or at discharge
- degree of disability at discharge from hospital

Disability measures included assessment of Glasgow Outcome Scale score or an equivalent measure if this was not available.
Secondary outcomes

Measures of morbidity, such as:

- the incidence of pulmonary complications including evidence of aspiration, pneumonia or atelectasis during hospital stay
- the incidence of documented cervical spine injury
- the incidence of and number of organs affected by multiple organ failure
- the length of stay in hospital and length of stay on the intensive care unit, where appropriate

Search methods for identification of studies

The searches were not restricted by publication status, date or language.

Electronic searches

We searched the following electronic databases:

- Cochrane Injuries Group Specialised Register (searched 19 December 2006);
- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRALL) (The Cochrane Library 2006, Issue 4);
- MEDLINE (1950 to November (week 3) 2006);
- EMBASE (1980 to week 50, December 2006);
- CINAHL (to December 2006);
- National Research Register (Issue 4, 2006);
- BIDS (December 2006);
- ICNARC (December 2006);
- Zetoc (searched 19 December 2006).

The full search strategies used to search CENTRAL, MEDLINE, EMBASE and National Research Register (NRR) are presented in Appendix 1. The searches of all other databases were based on these strategies.

Searching other resources

We searched the internet, checked the reference lists of relevant studies and, where possible, contacted the first author of each included study to identify further potentially eligible studies.

Data collection and analysis

Selection of studies

Two authors independently examined titles, abstracts and keywords of citations from electronic databases for eligibility. We obtained the full text of all relevant records and the two authors independently assessed whether each met the predefined inclusion criteria. We resolved disagreement by discussion.

Data extraction and management

Data were extracted independently by two authors.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

Trials were examined for evidence of adequacy of randomisation, allocation concealment and follow up. Allocation concealment was evaluated against Cochrane criteria as described by Higgins 2005:

- Grade A: adequate allocation concealment.
- Grade B: unclear, not described in the paper or could not be verified by contacting the authors.
- Grade C: inadequate allocation concealment.
- Grade D: allocation concealment was not used.

Where the method used to conceal allocation was not clearly reported, the study author(s) were contacted, when possible, for clarification.

Data synthesis

The results from the included studies were not combined in a meta-analysis due to the heterogeneity of patients, practitioners and the alternatives to intubation that were used.

RESULTS

Description of studies

See: Characteristics of included studies; Characteristics of excluded studies.

Results of the search

The combined search strategy identified 13,000 articles of which the full text of 452 were obtained.

Included studies

We identified three eligible RCTs, each of which was conducted in an urban setting with short prehospital to hospital transit times (Gausche 2000; Goldenberg 1986; Rabitsch 2003). There were no controlled trials or observational studies eligible for inclusion.

Gausche 2000

This trial compared paramedic endotracheal intubation (ETI) versus bag-valve-mask ventilation (BVM) and later physician emergency department (ED) ETI in 830 children, aged 13 years and under, who presented with a variety of prehospital aetiologies requiring airway intervention. Seventy-one per cent of the children...
had suffered a non-traumatic out-of-hospital (OOH) cardiac arrest, 13% a respiratory arrest, 8% status epilepticus and the remainder had mainly a traumatic coma aetiology. Drugs were not available to assist the paramedic ETI. The outcome measures were survival and neurologic outcome at acute hospital discharge.

Goldenberg 1986
This trial compared paramedic-operated ETI versus an oesophageal gastric tube airway (EGTA) in 175 adult non-traumatic out-of-hospital cardiac arrest patients. The main outcome measure was survival to hospital discharge.

Rabitsch 2003
This trial compared physician-operated ETI with a combi-tube in 172 adult non-traumatic out-of-hospital cardiac arrest patients. The main outcome measure was survival to hospital discharge. Further details are presented in the ‘Characteristics of included studies’ table.

Excluded studies
We identified a number of relevant observational studies. Each is described in detail in the table ‘Characteristics of excluded studies’. Other reviewed studies were excluded due to a lack of relevance to the review objectives in terms of the interventions performed or the outcomes considered. Examples of these, along with the review authors’ comments, are also in the excluded studies.

Risk of bias in included studies
Gausche 2000
This trial allocated paediatric patients to receive either paramedic ETI or BVM and later ED physician ETI by calendar day (odd or even). Age, gender, aetiologies for airway intervention and the proportion of children not further resuscitated at the ED were equivalent between the two randomised groups. However, within each aetiology there was no further breakdown of confounders (presenting rhythm for cardiac arrest, Glasgow Coma Score in other groups) other than that the proportion of children in cardiac arrest receiving bystander cardio-pulmonary resuscitation (CPR) was equivalent between the allocated trial groups. ETI was not attempted in 27% of patients randomised to receive it and, where attempted, the success rate was 57% (resulting in successful ETI in 42% of children allocated to receive it). The results were analysed on an intention-to-treat basis and an actual airway-received basis. It is possible that a percentage of those receiving BVM did not receive ED ETI as 5% of this group went from the ED to a hospital ward or home. Follow up was continued until discharge for survival and neurologic outcomes; there were 10 (1%) losses to follow up. Children were blinded to trial allocation, those performing airway care were not. The outcome assessors were not blinded to allocation but independently reviewed each outcome. The two assessors weighted kappa outcomes had very good agreement (k = 0.978 (0.93 to 1.0)). Allocation concealment was graded D.

Goldenberg 1986
This trial randomised consecutive adult OOH cardiac arrest patients to two interventions (ETI or EGTA) by means of random number generated cards. It was unclear whether or not the groups were equivalent in terms of numbers of shocks for ventricular fibrillation (VF) patients but equivalence for other confounders was demonstrated. A significant proportion (17%) of patients received the opposite airway intervention from that to which they had been randomised, due to technical difficulties; but an intention-to-treat analysis was presented. It was unclear what proportion of EGTA patients subsequently received ETI in the ED. Patients were followed up to hospital discharge in order to determine survival, which was the main outcome measure; there appeared to have been no losses to follow up. Patients were blinded to trial allocation, those performing airway interventions were not. It was unclear whether or not the outcome assessors were blinded (Grade B allocation concealment).

Rabitsch 2003
This trial allocated consecutive adult OOH cardiac arrest patients presenting to the EMS by calendar day (odd or even) to physician-operated ETI versus a combi-tube. Combi-tube patients were 40% more likely to have received bystander CPR at the arrest scene (8% versus 11%) but appeared similar in terms of other confounders. Three per cent of patients received the opposite intervention from that to which they had been allocated due to technical difficulties, however results were analysed on an intention-to-treat basis. It was unclear what proportion of combi-tube patients subsequently received ETI in the ED. Patients were followed up until hospital discharge in order to determine survival, which was the main outcome measure. There appeared to have been no losses to follow up. Patients were blinded to trial allocation, those performing airway interventions were not. The outcome assessors were blinded to trial allocation group (Grade D allocation concealment).

Effects of interventions
Gausche 2000
This trial compared paramedic ETI versus paramedic BVM and ED physician ETI in paediatric patients requiring prehospital airway intervention from a variety of aetiologies. The results indicated that there was no survival (26% versus 30%; OR 0.82, 95% CI 0.61 to 1.11) or good neurologic outcome (23% versus 20%; OR 0.87, 95% CI 0.62 to 1.22) advantage in children randomised to receive ETI versus BVM and later ED ETI should resuscitation be continued. This was an intention-to-treat analysis where only 42% of the group randomised actually received paramedic ETI. There was no difference in the hospital length of stay between survivors in the two groups.

Goldenberg 1986
This trial compared paramedic-operated ETI versus EGTA in adults with out-of-hospital non-traumatic cardiac arrest. The results indicated a small non-significant difference in survival to
hospital discharge in an intention-to-treat analysis of 175 patients (11.1% ETI versus 12.9% EGT A). Relative risk of survival with ETI was 0.86 (98% CI 0.39 to 1.90). Seventeen per cent of patients had different airway interventions from those for which they were randomised. When adjusted for, this widened the outcome difference (10.9 versus 15.4%) but the study was not powered to show this difference as significant. The reported insertion success and adequacy of ventilation rates were similar (90% versus 90% for insertion, 90% ETI versus 70 to 90% EGT A for ventilation).

**Discussion**

This review identified three trials that examined the efficacy of ETI compared to alternative airway management techniques in the prehospital setting. No single study showed a statistically significant difference in outcome between the treatment groups. Two trials were conducted in adult out-of-hospital non-traumatic cardiac arrest. A doubling of survival to hospital discharge was demonstrated in the combi-tube group (ETI 3% versus combi-tube 6%) with similar insertion success rates (94% versus 98%). The sample number of 172 patients was insufficient to show this difference as significant; relative risk of survival with ETI was 0.43 (95% CI 0.09 to 1.59). The pulmonary aspiration rate was 2% in the combi-tube group, 0% with ETI.

Similarly in adult trauma patients, 18 observational studies with four prospective (Bochicchio 2003; Davis 2003; Trupka 1995; Westhoff 2002) were found comparing ETI usually to BVM. The majority (13) of these studies related to the timing of ETI (prehospital ‘early’ (paramedic in some cases) versus ‘late’ with prehospital paramedic BVM and physician ED ETI) in heterogeneous groups of trauma patients. The remainder examined practice purely in the emergency department or the prehospital environment. One retrospective study examined ETI in adult hypothermia patients. The results of these studies were often significant but different studies with similar conduct and inclusion criteria reached contradictory findings. Once again the review group found issues with conflicting in each trial. Finally, the design of all three trials relates only to prehospital care in an urban setting.

At this time, having considered the included trials and other evidence, the review group suggest that currently there is insufficient high quality data available to comment on the efficacy of emergency ETI, an intervention often advocated as life saving.

**Authors’ Conclusions**

**Implications for practice**

Clinicians need to establish a safe airway and adequate ventilation for patients in emergency situations bearing in mind that the effi-
cacy of emergency endotracheal intubation, as currently practised, has not been rigorously studied.

The skill of the operator may be a key determinant of efficacy in all patient groups. Success rates are not reported in most studies and in paramedic studies to date those quoted are often less than desirable (< 95% after three attempts), which may reflect skill retention and operating conditions.

In non-traumatic cardiac arrest it is unlikely that intubation carries the same life saving benefit as early defibrillation and bystander CPR.

In paediatric and trauma patients the current evidence base provides no imperative to extend the practice of prehospital intubation in urban and short transit time systems.

**Implications for research**

Given the review findings and the large investment in paramedic intubation training, it would seem ethical to initiate a large, high quality randomised trial comparing ETI efficacy (involving competent practitioners) to basic manoeuvres (BVM) in urban out-of-hospital adult cardiac arrest. The findings of this trial would then determine the nature of future studies in trauma patients and other groups.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Kate Waterhouse and Clare Cooke for administrative support and DERA for funding.

**REFERENCES**

References to studies included in this review

Gausche 2000  **(published and unpublished data)**


Goldenberg 1986  **(published data only)**


Rabitsch 2003  **(unpublished data only)**


References to studies excluded from this review

Abbott 1998  **(published data only)**


Adams 1997  **(published data only)**


Atherton 1993  **(published data only)**


Auerbach 1983  **(published data only)**

Emergency intubation for acutely ill and injured patients (Review)

Aufderheide 1994  (published data only)

Bochicchio 2003  (published data only)

Broos 1993  (published data only)

Buchmann 1992  (published data only)

Bur 2001  (published data only)

Calkins 1999  (published data only)

Callaham 1996  (published data only)

Dansky 1989  (published data only)

Davis 2003  (published data only)

Don Michael 1985  (published data only)

Durham 1992  (published data only)

Eckstein 2000  (published data only)

Fortune 1997  (published data only)

Frankel 1997  (published data only)

Garner 1999  (published data only)

Garner 2001  (published data only)

Geehr 1985  (published data only)

Gordon 1995  (published data only)

Hammargren 1985  (published data only)

Hedges 2002  (published data only)

Hillis 1993  (published data only)

Holmberg 2002  (published data only)

Huf 1996  (published data only)

Karch 1996  (published data only)
Emergency intubation for acutely ill and injured patients (Review)

King 1994  (published data only)

Kuchinski 1991  (published data only)

Liberman 2000  (published data only)

Marwick 1991  (published data only)

Murray 2000  (published data only)

Norwood 1994  (published data only)

Ourlaquet 1997  (published data only)

Oswalt 1992  (published data only)

Pointer 1988  (published data only)

Rainer 1997  (published data only)

Regel 1997  (published data only)

Rhee 1994  (published data only)

Ruchholtz 2002  (published data only)

Rumball 1997  (published data only)

Sanson 1999  (published data only)

Schmidt 1992  (published data only)

Schneider 1995  (published data only)

Shea 1985  (published data only)

Sloane 2000  (published data only)

Staudinger 1994  (published data only)

Stratton 1998  (published data only)

Tanigawa 1998  (published data only)

Trupka 1995  (published data only)
Trupka A, Waydhas C, Nast-Kolb D, Schweiberer L. Effect of early intubation on the reduction of post-traumatic organ failure [Der...
Unsafe intubation for acutely ill and injured patients (Review)

Copyright © 2009 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Einfluss der Frunintubation auf die Reduktion des posttraumatischen.

Wald 1993 (published data only)

Westhoff 2002 (published data only)

Winchell 1997 (published data only)

Xeropotamos 1993 (published data only)

Additional references

Baker 1974

Champion 1990

Copes 1995

Gentleman 1992

Gildenberg 1985

Higgins 2005

Hussain 1994

Nolan 2005

Ram 2004

Regel 1995

Rotondo 1993

Stamatakis 1995

UK TARN 1996
United Kingdom Trauma and Audit Research Network. Major Trauma Outcome Study (MTOS). National Conference 1996. * Indicates the major publication for the study*
### Characteristics of included studies  
[ordered by study ID]  

**Gausche 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>Randomised controlled trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>830 patients aged &lt;12 years requiring OOH airway management from a variety of aetiologies. 2 EMS and &gt;22 hospital centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td>Paramedic prehospital ETI (no drugs) versus BVM and later ED ETI if resuscitation continued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Odds of survival and neurological status (Paediatric Cerebral Performance Category scale) at hospital discharge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>Intention-to-treat analysis. Groups randomised by calendar date (odd, even). Outcome assessors not blinded. 71% patients had non-traumatic OOH cardiac arrest. 13% respiratory arrest, 8% status epilepticus, rest mainly traumatic coma aetiology. Groups. 32% of whole sample not further resuscitated in ED. Similar breakdown in both groups. No attempt at ETI in 27% of those randomised to receive it. 57% success rate for attempted ETI. Secondary analysis by actual intervention suggests ETI harmful (non-equivalent groups). Time to airway intervention similar in both groups and transit times 5 minutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Risk of bias</strong></th>
<th>Authors’ judgement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment?</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>D - Not used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goldenberg 1986**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>Randomised controlled trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>175 OOH non-traumatic cardiac arrest patients. Single EMS and hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td>Paramedic ETI versus paramedic EGTA. Crossed over to alternative device if failed twice with the original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Survival to hospital discharge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>Intention-to-treat result however 17% had different airway to initial randomisation. Differences persist and are larger if analysed by actual airway received: 10.9 vs 15.4%. No of shocks for VF patients in randomised groups not given. Non-randomised control group n=125 (EOA) offered by authors survival 12% (ns) although response times shorter and bystander CPR more likely than in ETI, EGTA: (16% vs 13% vs 14 %). Success rates 90% for ETI and EGTA. Transit times &lt; 15 minutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Risk of bias**
### Rabitsch 2003

**Methods**
Randomised controlled trial.

**Participants**
172 OOH non-traumatic cardiac arrest patients. Single EMS and hospital centre.

**Interventions**
Physician ETI versus physician combi-tube.

**Outcomes**
Survival to hospital discharge.

**Notes**
Intention-to-treat analysis used with 3% patients having different airway to initial randomisation. combi group 1.4 times more likely to get bystander CPR (8% vs 11%). No data comparing time to defibrillation. Success rates 94% ETI, 98% combi. Transit times < 10 minutes.

### Risk of bias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Authors' judgement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment?</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>D - Not used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Characteristics of excluded studies  [ordered by study ID]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams 1997</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data. 4500 out of hospital (OOH) defibrillated non-traumatic cardiac arrest patients presenting to single EMS; subsequently transported to one of several hospitals. Paramedic ETI versus paramedic or EMT-D BVM. Survival to hospital discharge lower in ETI group for the same number of DC shocks: 1-3 shocks 7.6% vs 19.3 %. 4-6 shocks 7.0% vs 11.0%. &gt; 6 shocks 4.0% vs 10.0%. p &lt;0.002 for all. Outcome differences similar in witnessed/unwitnessed arrest. No adjustment for age, bystander CPR, time to first defibrillation. Success rates and transit times not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton 1993</td>
<td>Prospective controlled study comparing of use of combi tube with ETI. Calendar allocation for type of airway used by pre-hospital paramedics for cardiac arrest. No patient outcome data therefore excluded from 52 cases with combi tube (69% success rate) and 81 intubations (84% success). Combi tube also used successfully in 64% ET tube failures. Methodology unclear, data extraction difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auerbach 1983</td>
<td>43 out of hospital cardiac arrests studied prospectively. No control/comparison group. Entered all patients who had EGTA inserted prehospital and still present at time of arrival in ER. EGTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Reference</td>
<td>Study Design and Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aufderheide 1994</td>
<td>Retrospective observational study with data concerning survival after intubation from near hanging. Intubation performed more frequently in those who died, but severity of trauma not controlled for. No direct comparison possible therefore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bochicchio 2003</td>
<td>Prospective study 191 trauma patients with GCS &lt; 9 and head AIS &gt; 2 who survived an initial 48hrs after admission to one trauma centre. Paramedic prehospital rapid sequence ETI versus physician rapid sequence ETI in the ED. Hospital mortality 23% versus 12.4% P=0.05. Incidence of pneumonia 49% versus 22% P=0.02. Groups appear similar in terms of confounders but no adjustment at individual patient level. Field intubation associated with air transport, longer prehospital times and need for urgent neurosurgical intervention. Success rates not given but failures to intubate excluded from study. Ground transit times not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broos 1993</td>
<td>Retrospective review of prospectively recorded data. 121 trauma patients aged &gt;65 yrs admitted to a single centre. Prehospital or emergency department physician ETI (drugs not specified) versus basic manoeuvres. Hospital mortality rate 59% versus 5%. Differences in presenting GCS not adjusted for. No difference in ISS, age and comorbidity in two groups. No adjustment for gender and time to airway intervention. Success rates and transportation times not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchmann 1992</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data 561 trauma patients GCS &lt; 9 at scene and/or requiring neurosurgical intervention. Single trauma centre Physician rapid sequence ETI with drugs at scene versus on arrival in first hospital versus after transfer from first hospital to trauma centre Hospital mortality rates 27% versus 24% versus 24% (not significant). Median age and presenting GCS varied between groups (not adjusted for). No adjustment for injury severity scores or times to scene airway intervention, co-morbidity or gender. Success rates not reported. Ground transit times &lt; 30 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bur 2001</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data 276 OOH defibrillated non-traumatic cardiac arrests with ROSC. Single EMS and hospital centre. Physician ETI versus Physician BVM. Good Cerebral Performance Scores Category (1-2) at 6 months equally likely in both groups predictor. OR 0.51-2.31. Adjustment for age, presenting rhythm, bystander CPR, time to first defibrillation. No adjustment for number of shocks. ETI success rates not given. Transit times appear to range from 13 to 204 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calkins 1999</td>
<td>Not published when original search performed. Prospective randomised crossover study. Excluded because no patient outcome data. Small numbers (12 paramedics) and flawed (previous experience with ETT). Compared ETT, LMA and combitube. 36 manikin insertions under combat conditions. Significantly (p&lt;0.05) shorter time for LMA placement than combi-tube, but operator preference was for ETT and combi-tube.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callaham 1996</td>
<td>Prospective observational study 544 OOH non-traumatic cardiac arrest patients. Single EMS and hospital centre. Paramedic ETI versus paramedic or EMT-D BVM. Good Cerebral Performance Category scores at 6 and 12 months. Equally likely in both groups. OR 02-10. 90% of patients intubated. Up to 10% of cases may have had missing data on key variables in adjustments for confounders. Presenting rhythm and time to defibrillation adjusted for. No adjustment for age, bystander CPR, or number of shocks in VF patients. ETI success rates not given. Urban EMS, transit times &lt; 10 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danzl 1989</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data. 428 hypothermic patients (&lt;35°C) presenting to US hospitals 95% age &gt;12 yrs. Paramedic ETI or physician ED ETI (no drugs) versus BVM. Likelihood of hospital mortality 3 x higher in ETI group after adjustment for other confounders. No adjustment for presenting Glasgow Coma Score or time to first airway intervention. Success rates and transit times not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2003</td>
<td>Prospective observational study 836 trauma patients with head, or neck AIS &gt; 1, and GCS &lt; 9, and transport time &gt; 10 minutes to one of 5 trauma centres Paramedic prehospital rapid sequence ETI on 209 patients consecutively matched to BVM historical controls for age, gender, AIS score in body regions and receiving trauma centre. Adjusted odds of hospital mortality 1.6 times greater in ETI group p = 0.03. 41 retrospective exclusions for non-trauma diagnosis/low severity of injury (7 deaths in first 30 minutes) and protocol violations (250 initial number therefore then became - 209). Unspecified number intubated by aero-medical crew (physician or nurse) but crude outcome still worse in ETI group OR 1.6 when aero-medicals excluded. Paramedics attempted intubation first without drugs. Initial success rate 87% after 3 attempts rest intubated with combitube in ETI group. Morphine and midazolam given post RSI to reduce SBP. Not clear if/when most of control group were intubated in hospital. GCS not controlled for but where data available, head injury diagnoses similar. Data suggest that hyperventilation pCO2 &lt; 33mm Hg worsens outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Michael 1985</td>
<td>Meta-analysis of 4 studies comparing EGTA to ETI in/out of hospital cardiac arrest. Only outcomes were blood gas analysis therefore no survival data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham 1992</td>
<td>Retrospective review of prospectively collected data 389 patients undergoing emergency department thoracotomy at single trauma centre. Paramedic pre-hospital ETI versus BVM then ED physician ETI. Drugs not discussed. Hospital survival 25% versus 10% (p=0.06) stab wounds. 11% versus 4% GSW (p=0.09) 0% all blunt trauma. No adjustment for age, co-morbidity, ISS, gender, on scene physiology, time to pre-hospital airway intervention. &gt;75% penetrating trauma. ETI success rates not given or transit times. ETI associated with longer pre-hospital/CPR times in survivors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckstein 2000</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data 496 trauma patients requiring at scene airway intervention: subsequently transported to single centre. Paramedic ETI (no drugs) at scene versus paramedic BVM followed by physician ED/immediate operating room rapid sequence ETI. Odds of hospital death 5.3 times greater in paramedic ETI group after adjustment for age, gender, injury severity score and mechanism of injury. Age of two groups similar 54% injured by penetrating trauma. No adjustment for on scene physiology, co-morbidity and time form injury to airway intervention. Scene times similar in both groups. Success rates apparently &gt;99%. Urban ground transport times~10 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune 1997</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort analysis examining success of emergency cricothyroidotomy in facial injuries or with failed intubation. EMT performed 376 airway manoeuvres in 15,686 patients over 5 years. 56 received cricothyroidotomy. No comparative data, but using TRISS, 5 unexpected survivors and 6 unexpected deaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankel 1997</td>
<td>Retrospective review of prospectively recorded data 134 trauma registry patients admitted to one trauma centre requiring field or early ED intubation. Paramedic ETI (no drugs) versus BVM then ED physician rapid sequence ETI. Observed - expected mortality rate + 8% versus -14% adjusted for age, mechanism of injury, presenting physiology and injury severity score using US-MTOS coefficients. No adjustment for gender, co-morbidity and times to airway intervention. 81% paramedic versus 99% ED success rate. Adjustments based on US-MTOS rather than sample based coefficients. Urban ground transport for all patients specific times not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Study Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garner 1999</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data 296 trauma patients with blunt injury from RTA and initial GCS &lt; 9 who ‘survived initial resuscitation’ and were transported to either of two trauma centres. Physician prehospital rapid sequence ETI (n = 46) or paramedic ETI with no drugs (n = 89) versus BVM (n = 161) then ED physician rapid sequence ETI. Odds of good outcome (GOS) at last contact no different in ETI and BVM groups p = 0.84 adjusted for age, RTS, ISS, subdural haematoma and treatment by physician. 25% patients studied had no outcome data for analysis. Follow-up times differed between ETI and BVM patients. Intubation by physician significantly associated with improved outcome after adjustments OR 2.7 (1.48 - 4.95) versus all paramedic group. All non-intubated prehospital patients subsequently intubated in the ED. Treatment by physician associated with helicopter transport and longer prehospital times. Success rates or average ground transit times not reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garner 2001</td>
<td>Similar observational study of trauma patients to Garner study that has already been included. Compared outcomes between helicoptered trauma patients flown by physicians versus paramedics to one of two trauma centres. Not possible from this data to determine effect of ETI on outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geehr 1985</td>
<td>Prospective observational study 190 OOH non-traumatic cardiac arrest patients. Single EMS and hospital centre. Paramedic ETI versus paramedic EGTA Survival to hospital discharge 4.0% versus 4.3% (NS) 20 (11%) no data on airway intervention. Groups similar in terms of presenting rhythm and time to defibrillation in VF. EGTA group significantly younger. No data on bystander CPR and number of shocks for VF patients. ETI success rate 91%. Urban system transit times &lt; 20 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon 1995</td>
<td>Study of 2298 head injury patients over 20 years. Did not directly correlate airway management with outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammargren 1985</td>
<td>Crossover study comparing blood gas results of EGTA with ETT. No patient outcome data. 91 non-traumatic cardiac arrests, all with EGTA initially. 48 were changed to ETT and blood gases in both groups compared. Satisfactory ventilation with EGTA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges 2002</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data 501 trauma registry patients presenting with GCS &lt;9 to 21 'level 3' trauma centres. Physician rapid sequence ETI in ED versus physician BVM. Significance of ((observed - expected)/S error) mortality rate: -4.2 in both groups. Adjusted for age, mechanism of injury, presenting physiology by MTOS US coefficients. Gender similar in both groups. No adjustment for gender co-morbidity and time to airway intervention. Adjustments on MTOS rather than sample data predictions. Success rates and transit times not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillis 1993</td>
<td>Prospective observational study. 191 OOH non-traumatic cardiac arrest patients. 3 EMS systems single hospital centre. Paramedic ETI versus paramedic EOA versus paramedic or EMT-D BVM. Survival to hospital discharge 12.5% versus 4.5% versus 3.9% (ns). Significant improvement for ETI if EOA and BVM grouped together in comparison P&lt;0.05. Age of groups appears similar. Bystander CPR less likely in non ETI group (27 versus 35%). Also incomplete adjustment for other important confounders: Presenting rhythm, time to defibrillation and number of shocks in VF. Further group of 60 patients offered by authors as control not considered for review as no data on presenting rhythm. Transit times &lt; 15 minutes. ETI success rates not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmberg 2002</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data 10,966 OOH non-traumatic cardiac arrest patients. Multiple EMS and hospitals. Paramedic ETI versus paramedic or EMT-D BVM. Prediction of one-month survival. ETI independent predictor of poor outcome. OR 0.51-0.99. In multiple logistic regression result up to 40% of cases were excluded due to missing data. Effect of ETI disappeared if response times/times to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
defibrillation accounted for. Otherwise full adjustment for all known confounders. ETI success rates not given. Transit times ~10 minutes.

Huf 1996
Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data 377 multiply injured patients with lung contusion, single trauma centre. Pre hospital physician rapid sequence ETI versus ED physician rapid sequence ETI. Hospital mortality 22.1% versus 23.7% non-significant. Age and injury severity similar between groups. No adjustment for presenting physiology, gender and comorbidity. No adjustment for times to airway intervention. Non-significant reduction in ARDS + pneumonia rate in pre-hospital ETI group which had significantly shorter ICU times. Success rates and transit times not given.

Karch 1996
Retrospective cohort of 94 trauma patients requiring field intubation. Intubation success rate not statistically different in survivors and non-survivors but groups not comparable. Non-survivors had worse TS/ISS and GCS. Blood pressure was a strong predictor of survival.

King 1994
Prospective observational study 137 physician attended in hospital non traumatic cardiac arrests. Single centre Physician ETI versus physician/nurse BVM. Six month survival 12.7% versus 36.7% (P<0.005). No adjustment for any confounder.

Kuchinski 1991
Retrospective review of prospectively recorded data 41 trauma registry patients admitted to single centre ISS<16. Physician rapid sequence ETI for agitation versus observation of non agitated patients. Hospital mortality 5% versus 0%. Mean cost per hospital stay $7150 versus $3456 p<0.05. Differences in age, physiology and ISS between groups not adjusted for. No adjustment for gender, or co-morbidity. ETI success rate 95%. Death resulting from unrecognised oesophageal intubation. Transit times not specified.

Liberman 2000
Meta analysis of studies comparing prehospital ALS and BLS for trauma patients. Not possible to separate out the effect of ETI from ALS.

Marwick 1991
Prospective observational study 710 physician attended in hospital non traumatic cardiac arrests. Single centre. Physician ETI versus physician/nurse BVM. Survival to hospital discharge significantly less likely in intubated group. OR 0.2 - 0.9. Adjusted for all confounders except number of shocks in VF patients.

Murray 2000
Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data 894 trauma patients with GCS < 9 and head AIS > 3 received by 13 trauma centres. Paramedic prehospital ETI (no drugs) versus paramedic prehospital attempted (failed) ETI versus paramedic prehospital BVM Relative risk of hospital mortality 1.74 (1.41- 2.00) times higher ETI versus BVM 1.53 (1.15 - 1.85) failed ETI versus BVM. Adjusted for gender, GCS, head AIS score, ISS, transport mode (ground air), mechanism of injury and associated injury. 57/178 (>33%) failure rate after 3 attempts for ETI with no drugs. Only 754 included in relative risk analysis (missing data). Results similar in matched patients sub-sample (for age also). Not clear if failed ETI or BVM patients later intubated in trauma centre. Apparent inadequate respiratory effort was indication for intubation. All ground transportation times not specified.

Norwood 1994
Retrospective cohort analysis of emergency room intubations over a 4-year period. Excluded because no comparison with any other airway device. 229 patients with mean ISS 29 and mean RTS 9, intubated in emergency room. Concluded intubation is safe in ER if performed by experienced personnel using drugs. 6 cricothyroidotomies for failed intubation (2 died of severe head injuries GCS 3) and 8 cervical spine injuries with no cord damage. 1 possible aspiration during intubation left hospital alive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orliaguet 1997</td>
<td>Prospective observational study of 153 patients with in-field intubation performed by physicians. No treatment comparison, and only outcome measure studied was pulmonary aspiration. Concludes prehospital intubation by physicians has a low risk of complications (compared to paramedic studies).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswalt 1992</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data 82 trauma registry patients to one trauma centre. Paramedic ETI (no drugs) versus physician rapid sequence ETI with drugs in ED &lt;10 mins, 10 mins - 2 hrs, &gt;2hrs after arrival. Significance of (observed - expected)/standard error mortality rate. Only significantly (negative) in &gt; 2 hrs group. Adjusted for age, mechanism of injury and presenting physiology by MTOS US coefficients. No adjustment for gender, co-morbidity or time to airway intervention. Adjustments made from US MTOS coefficients. ED deaths/cricothyroidotomies excluded. No failed intubations. Transit times not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointer 1988</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data 383 OOH non-traumatic cardiac arrest patients. Single EMS and hospital paramedic ETI versus paramedic BVM. Survival to hospital admission 23% versus 8%. 93% of patients intubated, = 7% failure after 3 attempts. Significant complication rate. No adjustment for any confounder. Transit times not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainer 1997</td>
<td>Prospective observational study 240 non-traumatic OOH cardiac arrest patients. Single EMS and hospital centre. Paramedic ETI versus paramedic EMT-D BVM. Survival to hospital admission 15% versus 23% (ns). Intubation data missing on 10% of cases. Inadequate adjustment for presenting rhythm, bystander CPR, age and time to first defibrillation. No adjustment for number of shocks and witnessed arrest. ETI success rate not given. Transit times &lt;10 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regel 1997</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data. 1223 trauma registry patients with ISS&gt;20. Physician prehospital intubation versus basic manoeuvres. No mortality rates given only multiorgan failure rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhee 1994</td>
<td>Randomised controlled trial comparing nasal intubation with oral intubation and neuromuscular blockade in adult trauma patients. Helicopter crew consisted of nurses. Excluded because heavily flawed. Low power, outcome data analysis unclear, no intention to treat analysis. Crew allowed to attempt oral intubation or cricothyroidotomy before randomisation, and also to cross over the assigned technique based on their clinical beliefs about the patient. 174 patients entered but many excluded from data so data from only 77 analysed. 44 nasal and 33 NMB. Intubation times for both procedures were very long (2.9 mins nasal, 5.9 mins oral) although similar success rates (79.5% nasal, 75.8% oral).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruchholtz 2002</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data 44 pairs of severe thoracic trauma GCS &gt;7 patients matched for age, gender, survival probability and mechanism (blunt/penetrating) according to intubation status. 33 participating hospitals. Intubation by physicians in the prehospital environment (EI versus later physician intubation in ED or ICU) (DI) (drugs not specified). In hospital mortality 13.6% versus 4.5% (non-significant). Low power. Multiple exclusions 457 initially eligible patients to 44 matched pairs (for missing data, interhospital transfer, and death within 24 hours). EI patients longer scene times, more frequent helicopter transport, more on scene fluid. Multiple different hospitals. Success rate not reported. 2 DI never intubated. Transit times 8-20 minutes 50% in helicopter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumball 1997</td>
<td>Modified randomised crossover comparison of PTL, LM and Combitube with BVN used by medical assistants pre-hospital. Assessed for control of ventilatory parameters by blood gases and spirometry. 470 patients in cardiac arrest: 142 PTL, 147 LM, 90 Combitube, 91 BVN. Unclear if groups similar with respect to initial rhythm, although response times similar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Study Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No significant difference in insertion rates and ventilation between devices, although subjective evaluation of BVM was worst overall.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insertion rates 80% for modified tubes i.e. 1 in 5 failure risk when used prehospital.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanson 1999</td>
<td>244 entrapped trauma patients managed by a Regional Helicopter Emergency Medical Service. Not possible to directly correlate intubation status to outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt 1992</td>
<td>Retrospective review of prospectively recorded data. 407 trauma patients transferred by helicopter in US and Germany. Unable to correlate airway management status with outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider 1995</td>
<td>Prospective study using historical controls. No comparison of airway devices. Physician led resuscitation of pre-hospital cardiac arrests. Examined impact of standardised training. 145 total cases, 64 before training, and 81 after. No significant differences in survival or discharge from hospital. Significant differences in the impact of training were earlier intubation and greater use of ET adrenaline in PEA/asystole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shea 1985</td>
<td>Prospective observational study 374 OOH defibrillated non-traumatic cardiac arrest patients. Single EMS and hospital centre. Paramedic ETI versus paramedic EGTA. If ETI failed twice switched to EGTA. Long term survival (time period not specified) 11.5% versus 16.2% (ns). 78 (21%) of cases excluded from analysis due to protocol violations, missing data or non cardiac cause of arrest. Groups similar in terms of age and response times. Bystander CPR and witnessed arrest more likely in EGTA group. No adjustment for number of shocks. Success rates 93.4 versus 95%. Transit times less than 5 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloane 2000</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data 75 patients with GCS &lt;9 and Head AIS &gt;2 (no other serious injury) same trauma centre. Physician/nurse prehospital ETI (rapid sequence) prior to helicopter transit versus BVM then ED physician ETI (rapid sequence) 30 day mortality 14% versus 22% (p = 0.54). Time period of study longer (88 - 95) for prehospital group (versus 93 - 94). 10% ED cases may not have been eligible for inclusion due to missing data. Further 50% ED cases and unspecified number prehospital cases not eligible due to non-rapid sequence ETI method. Low power study. Pre-hospital ETI significantly younger (p&lt;0.01) - not adjusted for; otherwise groups appear similar in terms of confounders. Success rates 98% in both groups after 3 attempts. Higher rates of pneumonia in field ETI group. Ground transit time for ED cases 13.3 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staudinger 1994</td>
<td>86 out of hospital cardiac arrest patients. Prospective study, one at centre. Paramedics ETI versus Combi. Results not analysed on intention to treat or actual airway received basis but on groups where airway was attempted. Results cross as 22 patients have attempts at both. No adjustment for any confounder. Success rates 71% for each (poor).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanigawa 1998</td>
<td>Retrospective review of use of airway devices in 12,020 cases of non-traumatic cardiac arrest. No prognosis data but compared successful use of LM, Combitube and EGTA in Japanese EMTs. Combitube most appropriate choice for successful insertion and ventilation, but greater incidence of soft tissue injuries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trupka 1995
Prospective observational study 131 trauma patients aged 16-70 with ISS >18 within 6 hours of injury at single trauma centre. Early physician rapid response ETI (<2 hours after injury) or later physicians rapid sequence ETI. Hospital mortality (15% versus 26% and multi organ failure) (28% versus 37%) both ns. No difference in age or gender between groups. ISS higher P< 0.001 and presenting blood pressure lower in early intubation group. No adjustment for presenting GCS, gender, co-morbidity or time to pre-hospital airway intervention. ETI success rates and transit times not reported. 6 patients not intubated at all (100% survival). 21% of sample who died in first 24 hours excluded.

### Wald 1993
Study of 170 patients with head injury comparing outcomes in those with/without hypoxia and/or hypotension. Unable to correlate airway management with outcome from this data.

### Westhoff 2002
Prospective observational study 48 patients with thoracic trauma at 22 centres. Pre-hospital physician rapid sequence ETI versus BVM then ED physician rapid sequence ETI. Hospital mortality 8% versus 36%. Multi organ failure 42% versus 80%. Emergency department groups 10 years older on average. ISS scores similar. No adjustment for presenting physiology, co-morbidity, gender and times to scene airway intervention. Success rates not given. Mainly helicopter transport.

### Winchell 1997
Retrospective analysis of prospectively recorded data a) 1092 blunt trauma patients with GCS<9 admitted to one of six trauma centres, ground transfers b) 502 blunt trauma patients GCS<9 air transport to one of six trauma centres a) Paramedic pre-hospital ETI (no drugs) versus BVM b) Paramedic or nurse pre-hospital rapid sequence ETI versus BVM Hospital mortality a) 26% versus 36% p<0.05 b) 35% versus 21% p<0.05. a) Biggest mortality difference if GCS>3 isolated closed head injury 8.6 versus 22%. Groups similar in terms of age, ISS, presenting GCS. No adjustment for gender, co-morbidity, times to airway intervention. b) Nonsignificant difference in severe closed head injury. No adjustment for all other confounders. ETI success rates 99% in b) not specified in a) Transit time not specified. Later intubation rates in trauma centre not specified.

### Xeropotamos 1993
Retrospective, descriptive data examining the efficacy of advanced airway techniques in 143 cases (out of 600 seen) over a 12-month period. Inherently biased because didn’t compare ET intubation with cricothyroidotomy in all cases. Looked only at cases where ET intubation not possible or failed, 11 in total, of whom 4 survived. Concluded surgical airway can be a lifesaving procedure if performed rapidly.
DATA AND ANALYSES

This review has no analyses.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Search strategy

CENTRAL issue 4, 2006
#1 MeSH descriptor Intubation explode all trees
#2 (intubate* or intubation):ti or (intubate* or intubation):ab
#3 (#1 OR #2)
#4 MeSH descriptor Heart Arrest explode all trees
#5 MeSH descriptor Myocardial Infarction explode all trees
#6 MeSH descriptor Resuscitation explode all trees
#7 (sudden cardiac death):ti or (sudden cardiac death):ab
#8 heart near (injur$ or rupture$ or massage) #9 cardiac near massage
#10 cardiopulmonary resuscitation
#11 advanced cardiac life support
#12 ((myocardial) near (infarc* or hibernation or contraction or reperfusion or reperfusion injury)):ti or ((myocardial) near (infa rc* or hibernation or contraction or reperfusion or reperfusion injury)):ab
#13 myocard* near stun*
#14 cardiogenic near shock*
#15 artificial respiration
#16 (#4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR #12 OR #13 OR #14 OR #15)
#17 (#3 AND #16)
#18 MeSH descriptor Time Factors explode all trees
#19 (acute or emergency or emergencies or pre hospital or early intervention or delayed intervention or EI or DI or timing or scene):ti
or (acute or emergency or emergencies or pre hospital or early intervention or delayed intervention or EI or DI or timing or scene):ab
#20 MeSH descriptor Emergencies explode all trees
#21 (#18 OR #19 OR #20)
#22 (#17 AND #21)

MEDLINE 1950 to 2006 Nov (week 3)
1. exp Intubation/
2. (intubate$ or intubation).ab,ti.
3. exp Heart Arrest/
4. exp Myocardial Infarction/
5. exp Resuscitation/
6. (sudden adj3 cardiac adj3 death).ab,ti.
7. (heart adj3 (injur$ or rupture$ or massage)).ab,ti.
8. (cardiac adj1 massag$).ab,ti.
9. "cardiopulmonary resuscitation".ab,ti.
10. "advanced cardiac life support".ab,ti.
11. (myocardial adj3 (infar$ or hibernation or contraction or reperfusion or "reperfusion injury")).ab,ti.
12. (myocard$ adj1 stun$).ab,ti.
14. "artificial respiration".ab,ti.
15. 1 or 2
16. or/3-15
17. 15 and 16
18. exp time factors/
19. (acute or emergency or emergencies or prehospital or “early intervention” or “delayed intervention” or “EI” or “DI” or timing or scene).ab,ti.
20. exp Emergencies/
21. or/18-20
22. 17 and 21
23. Randomized controlled trial.pt.
24. (random or randomly or randomised or randomized).ab,ti.
25. 23 or 24
26. exp Animals/
27. exp Humans/
28. 26 not (26 and 27)
29. 25 not 28
30. 22 and 29

EMBASE 1980 to week 50, Dec 2006
1. exp intubation/
2. (intubate$ or intubation).ab,ti.
3. exp Heart Arrest/
4. exp Heart Infarction/
5. exp Resuscitation/
6. (sudden adj3 cardiac adj3 death).ab,ti.
7. (heart adj3 (injur$ or rupture$ or massage)).ab,ti.
8. cardiac massage.ab,ti.
9. cardiopulmonary resuscitation.ab,ti.
10. advanced cardiac life support.ab,ti.
11. (myocardial adj3 (infarc$ or hibernation or contraction or reperfusion or “reperfusion injury”) ).ab,ti.
12. (myocard$ adj1 stun$).ab,ti.
14. artificial respiration.ab,ti.
15. 1 or 2
16. or/3-14
17. 15 and 16
18. exp time/
19. (acute or emergency or emergencies or pre hospital or early intervention or delayed intervention or EI or DI or timing or scene).ab,ti.
20. exp emergency/
21. or/18-20
22. 17 and 21
23. placebo.ti,ab.
24. groups.ti,ab.
25. exp randomized controlled trial/
26. (random or randomly or randomised or randomized).ti,ab.
27. exp animals/
28. exp humans/
29. 27 not (27 and 28)
30. 23 or 24 or 25 or 26
31. 30 not 29
32. 22 and 31

National Research Register Issue 4, 2006
1. INTUBATION explode tree 1 (MeSH)
2. (intubate* or intubation)
3. (#1 or #2)
4. EMERGENCIES explode all trees (MeSH)
5. TIME FACTORS explode all trees (MeSH)
6. (emergency or emergencies)
7. (acute or emergency or emergencies or (pre next hospital) or (early next intervention) or (delayed next intervention) or ei or di or timing or scene)
8. (#4 or #5 or #6 or #7)
9. (#3 and #8)

WHAT'S NEW

Last assessed as up-to-date: 3 December 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
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