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RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the clinical effectiveness of pediatric laryngeal tube airways for patients requiring airway stabilization?

2. What are the evidence-based guidelines regarding the use of pediatric laryngeal tube airways for patients requiring airway stabilization?

KEY FINDINGS

One randomized controlled trial and two non-randomized studies were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness of pediatric laryngeal tube airways for patients requiring airway stabilization.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, The Cochrane Library (2015, Issue 3), University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. No filters were applied to limit the retrieval by study type. Where possible, retrieval was limited to the human population. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2010 and March 26, 2015. Internet links were provided, where available.

The summary of findings was prepared from the abstracts of the relevant information. Please note that data contained in abstracts may not always be an accurate reflection of the data contained within the full article.

Disclaimer: The Rapid Response Service is an information service for those involved in planning and providing health care in Canada. Rapid responses are based on a limited literature search and are not comprehensive, systematic reviews. The intent is to provide a list of sources of the best evidence on the topic that CADTH could identify using all reasonable efforts within the time allowed. Rapid responses should be considered along with other types of information and health care considerations. The information included in this response is not intended to replace professional medical advice, nor should it be construed as a recommendation for or against the use of a particular health technology. Readers are also cautioned that a lack of good quality evidence does not necessarily mean a lack of effectiveness particularly in the case of new and emerging health technologies, for which little information can be found, but which may in future prove to be effective. While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of the report to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete and up to date, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not liable for any loss or damages resulting from use of the information in the report.

Copyright: This report contains CADTH copyright material and may contain material in which a third party owns copyright. This report may be used for the purposes of research or private study only. It may not be copied, posted on a web site, redistributed by email or stored on an electronic system without the prior written permission of CADTH or applicable copyright owner.

Links: This report may contain links to other information available on the websites of third parties on the Internet. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third party sites is governed by the owners’ own terms and conditions.
SELECTION CRITERIA

One reviewer screened citations and selected studies based on the inclusion criteria presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Designs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

Rapid Response reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, and evidence-based guidelines.

One randomized controlled trial (RCT) and two non-randomized studies were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness of pediatric laryngeal tube airways for patients requiring airway stabilization. No relevant health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, or evidence-based guidelines were identified.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

One RCT\(^1\) compared the effectiveness of pediatric laryngeal tube (LT) and laryngeal mask airways (LMA) for positive pressure ventilation in patients in different head and neck positions. Leak pressures were significantly higher for the LT in all positions. The authors concluded that LT might be the most appropriate choice for anesthetized children requiring ventilation. Two non-randomized studies\(^2\)\(^-\)\(^3\) examined out-of-hospital pediatric airway management, including the use of LT, in the United States. The use of alternate airways, including LT, was reported to be successful in 87% of cases.\(^3\) Results specifically related to pediatric LT were not presented in the abstracts.
REFERENCES SUMMARIZED

Health Technology Assessments
No literature identified.

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses
No literature identified.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Non-Randomized Studies


Guidelines and Recommendations
No literature identified.
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APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Randomized Controlled Trials – Simulation

PubMed: PM23435218

PubMed: PM2229954

Non-Randomized Studies – Simulation

PubMed: PM23076987

PubMed: PM22858748

PubMed: PM21480773

Review Articles

PubMed: PM24028649


Additional References