

Journal of Trauma & Treatment

Open Access

Stage of Respiration During Removal of Intercostal Catheters: A Review of Physiology and Literature

Winkle B^{1*} and Nair L²

¹Department of Surgery, Royal Darwin Hospital, NT, Australia ²Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, The Prince Charles Hospital, QLD, Australia

Abstract

Insertion of an Intercostal Catheter (ICC) is an accepted treatment for a pneumothorax (primary, secondary, traumatic or iatrogenic), haemothorax, pleural effusion or post thoracic surgery. Reinsertion of an ICC is the most common complication of removal, primarily due to recurrence of a pneumothorax. There are many guidelines for when to remove an ICC and criteria that must be met to reduce incidence of recurrent pneumothorax. However there is a significant lack of discussion regarding the exact procedure to remove an ICC, with specific focus on the stage of breathing required.

Keywords: Traumatic pneumothorax; Intrapleural pressure; H₂O; Thoracic intrapleural pressure

Introduction

During normal respiration, the pleural space is a closed system with a pressure that is negative, relative to the surrounding atmosphere. This negative pressure is maintained by the mechanical properties of the lung tissue, the chest wall, tensile forces of pleural fluid and lung surfactant [1,2]. The thoracic intrapleural pressure in a healthy upright lung at relaxed end-expiration lies between -3 cm H₂O at the lung bases and -8 cm H₂O at the apices. The mean intrapleural pressure is approximately -5 cm H₂O. During normal physiological tidal breathing the mean intrapleural pressure is reduced further to -8 cm H₂O at end-inspiration [2].

Thus, when removing an ICC, the clinician should aim for a minimal pressure gradient. Physiologically, this would mean that during forced expiration, enhanced by a Valsalva manoeuvre, the gradient would be decreased or possibly raise the intrapleural pressure above that of the atmosphere [3]. However, this places the patient in a position to draw a larger breath in, thus rapidly changing the pressure gradient and allowing for great entrainment of air into the pleural cavity.

This article aims to discuss the physiological basis for when to remove an ICC and review the current literature surrounding this topic.

Literature Review

Articles were sourced from MEDLINE search using PubMed using search terms of "Tube thoracostomy removal", "Intercostal catheter removal" and "Chest Tube removal ". Each search term was then re used with "stage of respiration" added.

Articles were excluded on basis of relevance to topic, if they were a designed protocol or guideline, if primary outcomes were focussed on the equipment used or if the primary outcome did not assess the removal technique. Guidelines were sources from Google Scholar and PubMed.

Results and Discussion

143 articles were found using the above search method. Only 3

articles were deemed suitable based on the criteria. Cerfolio et al. published a randomised control trial in 2012 in which they attempted to determine the best technique for removal of an ICC post lung resection. This study found that ff the 179 patients randomized to have their chest tube removed on full inspiration, 58 (32%) had a larger or new pneumothorax after chest tube removal and 5 (3%) required intervention or delayed discharge. Of the 163 patients randomized to have their chest tube removed on full expiration, 32 (19%) had a larger or new pneumothorax after chest tube removal [4]. Due to the results, this study was discontinued early and remains underpowered to provide significant statistical evidence.

Bell et al. conducted a similar study on 102 ICCs in 69 patients with traumatic pneumothorax requiring ICC insertion. Patients were randomised to removal at end inspiration or end expiration. Of 52 ICC removals at end inspiration, there were 4 incidences of recurrence. In 50 removals at end expiration, there were 3 incidences of recurrence [5]. This study found the stage of respiration to be equivocal.

Thitvaraporn et al. performed a randomised control trial in 2017 assessing whether the addition of a Valsalva manoeuvre reduced the rate of recurrence of pneumothorax. A party balloon was used as an adjunct to help patients perform an effective Valsalva. This study contained 48 patients, divided into 4 groups; Group A: classic inspired, group B: classic expired, group C: balloon-inspired; and group D: balloon-expired. Recurrence rates in Groups A and B were 15.4 and 16.8 respectively, compared to 0% in Groups C and D3. These results are limited by very small sample size and correlate to an incidence of only 2 patients in each group. While Valsalva manoeuvre may be of benefit, there is no difference between stages of respiration.

*Corresponding author: Winkle B, Department of Surgery, Royal Darwin Hospital, NT-0810, Australia, Tel: +61889228888; E-mail: Brendan.Winkle@nt.gov.au

Received : January 31, 2020; Accepted March 02, 2020; Published March 09, 2020

Citation: Winkle B, Nair L (2020) Stage of Respiration During Removal of Intercostal Catheters: A Review of Physiology and Literature. J Trauma Treat 9: 453.

Copyright: © 2020 Winkle B, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

None of these studies were able to demonstrate significance between stage of respiration on removal.

Guidelines on ICC removal reviewed were from the British Thoracic Society [6], the NHS [7], Nursing Standard [8], the Royal Children's Hospital [9] and The Agency for Clinical innovation [10]. Of the 5 guidelines reviewed, 4 recommended removal on exhalation, with or without Valsalva. Only the ACI guideline made no mention of stage of respiration, instead focussing on pinching the skin to seal off the tract [10]. Of note is that 4 of the reviewed guidelines all based their recommendations on the British Thoracic Society Guideline from 2016. In this guideline, no evidence is given to support their recommendation, nor is there any discussion of the underlying physiology.

Conclusion

Removal of a chest drain is a common practice in any hospital. It has been a common and long held belief that removal on expiration, possibly with a Valsalva manoeuvre, is the safest and most effective method. However, this places the patient in a position to inhale rapidly and entrain air. There is currently no definitive evidence to provide a strong recommendation for the most effect method, however current guidelines that strongly recommend one method over the other should be regarded with caution.

References

- 1. Kesieme EB, Dongo A, Ezemba N, Irekpita E, Jebbin N, et al. (2012) Tube thoracostomy: Complications and its management. Pulm Med p. 1-10.
- Van Miert C, Dwan K, Hill R, Hoenig MR, Gruen RL, et al. (2012) Suction versus no suction for chest drain management. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, New Jersey, USA.
- Thitivaraporn P, Narueponjirakul N, Samorn P (2017) Randomized controlled trial of chest tube removal aided by a party balloon. Asian Cardiovasc Thorac Ann 25: 522-527.
- Cerfolio RJ, Bryant AS, Skylizard L, Minnich DJ (2013) Optimal technique for the removal of chest tubes after pulmonary resection. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 145: 1535-1539.
- Bell RL, Ovadia P, Abdullah F, Spector S, Rabinovici R, et al. (2000) Chest tube removal: End-inspiration or end-expiration? J Trauma Inj Infect Crit Care 50: 674-677.
- 6. Laws D (2003) BTS guidelines for the insertion of a chest drain Thorax 58: 53 59.
- 7. Ciacca LD, Neal M, Highcock M, Bruce M, SnowdenJ, et al. (2017) Guidelines for the insertion and management of chest drains.
- 8. Allibone E (2015) How to remove a chest drain. Nurs Stand. 30: 34-36.
- 9. Royal Childrens Hospital M. Chest Drain Management.
- 10. https://www.aci.health.nsw.gov.au/resources/respiratory/pleural-drains/ pleural-drains-in-adults