

5-31-2017

## Preventing Isolated Perioperative Reintubation: Who is at highest risk?


Tyler M. Bauer, MD  
*Thomas Jefferson University*

Adam P. Johnson, MD  
*Thomas Jefferson University*

Chris Wirtalla, MD  
*University of Pennsylvania*

Jordan E. Goldhammer, MD  
*Thomas Jefferson University*

Rachel R. Kelz, MD  
*University of Pennsylvania*  
Follow this and additional works at: <https://jdc.jefferson.edu/patientsafetyposters>

 Part of the [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#)  
See next page for additional authors

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Bauer, MD, Tyler M.; Johnson, MD, Adam P.; Wirtalla, MD, Chris; Goldhammer, MD, Jordan E.; Kelz, MD, Rachel R.; and Cowan, MD, Scott W., "Preventing Isolated Perioperative Reintubation: Who is at highest risk?" (2017). *House Staff Quality Improvement and Patient Safety Conference (2016-2019)*. Poster 67. <https://jdc.jefferson.edu/patientsafetyposters/67>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Jefferson Digital Commons. The Jefferson Digital Commons is a service of Thomas Jefferson University's [Center for Teaching and Learning \(CTL\)](#). The Commons is a showcase for Jefferson books and journals, peer-reviewed scholarly publications, unique historical collections from the University archives, and teaching tools. The Jefferson Digital Commons allows researchers and interested readers anywhere in the world to learn about and keep up to date with Jefferson scholarship. This article has been accepted for inclusion in House Staff Quality Improvement and Patient Safety Conference (2016-2019) by an authorized administrator of the Jefferson Digital Commons. For more information, please contact: [JeffersonDigitalCommons@jefferson.edu](mailto:JeffersonDigitalCommons@jefferson.edu).

---

**Authors**

Tyler M. Bauer, MD; Adam P. Johnson, MD; Chris Wirtalla, MD; Jordan E. Goldhammer, MD; Rachel R. Kelz, MD; and Scott W. Cowan, MD



## Background

- Postoperative respiratory complications occur in 1.03% of surgery patients with an average costs of \$62,704 per patient, per event.<sup>1,2</sup>
- Post-operative respiratory failure is often secondary to a concurrent severe complication, such as cardiac arrest, sepsis, pneumonia, aspiration, or pulmonary embolism.<sup>3</sup>
- Isolated perioperative reintubation (IPR), defined as unplanned intubation in the first 24 hours of surgery without concurrent complications, has not been well characterized in the literature.
- IPR likely occurs due to one or a combination of the following<sup>3,4</sup>:
  - Opioid overdose
  - Over-sedation
  - Residual paralysis
  - Fluid overload.
- IPR represents a rare but possibly preventable cause for respiratory failure in the immediate postoperative period.

## Objectives

1. We aim to characterize IPR nationally through a retrospective review of the National Surgical Quality Improvement Program participant user file (NSQIP PUF).
2. Identify risk factors for IPR including analysis of procedure type and preoperative characteristics.

## Methods

- The 2014 NSQIP PUF was queried for all observations.
- Study and event exclusions were applied as below (Figure 1A and B)
- Procedures were grouped by Current procedural terminology (CPT) code, as recommended in the NSQIP appendix B file.
- IPR was analyzed with known risk factors and procedure grouping using chi square analysis ( $p < 0.001$ )
- Multivariable logistic regression Analysis was used to analyze for independent risk factors ( $p < 0.05$ )
  - Inclusion into the multivariable analysis was based on a chi square  $p$  value  $< 0.1$ .

Figure 1A: Study Exclusions





Figure 1B: Event Exclusions



## Results

- Chi-squared analysis identified 22 patient covariates and 18 CPT procedure groups that were associated with IPR ( $p < 0.1$ ) and included in the multivariable analysis.
- Multivariable logistic regression analysis identified 12 patient factors and 8 operation types significantly associated with an elevated likelihood of IPR ( $p < 0.05$ ).

IPR Covariate	OR	P> z	95% CI
<b>Preoperative risk factor</b>			
Age (>60 years)	1.44	<0.001	1.2 - 1.72
Current smoker	1.25	0.023	1.03 - 1.51
Report of dyspnea (rest and moderate)	1.76	<0.001	1.41 - 2.19
Ascites (in prev 30days)	2.22	0.039	1.04 - 4.74
COPD (Severe)	1.88	<0.001	1.49 - 2.37
CHF(in prev 30 days)	1.89	0.002	1.27 - 2.81
HTN	1.44	<0.001	1.19 - 1.75
Transfusion preoperatively in last 72 hours	2.87	<0.001	1.94 - 4.26
Wound classification (>= 2)	1.32	0.007	1.08 - 1.62
ASA classification (>= 3)	3.10	<0.001	2.44 - 3.93
Operative time (>3 hours)	1.65	<0.001	1.38 - 1.99
African American	1.34	0.013	1.06 - 1.7
<b>Procedure</b>			
Colectomy	1.45	0.009	1.1 - 1.92
Esophagectomy	3.79	<0.001	1.95 - 7.36
CAS	7.92	0.041	1.08 - 57.89
EVAR	2.37	<0.001	1.5 - 3.73
Aorticoilliac (open)	2.36	0.001	1.4 - 3.98
Spine	0.62	0.046	0.39 - 0.99
Nephrectomy	1.74	0.026	1.07 - 2.84
Cystectomy	2.07	0.039	1.04 - 4.12
TKA	0.31	0.010	0.13 - 0.75
Hip Fracture	1.79	0.020	1.1 - 2.93

## Discussion

- We identified a national IPR of 0.1% in all eligible patients.
- Ten procedures demonstrate a higher than average likelihood of IPR, and two, spine and knee arthroplasty, demonstrate a lower likelihood.
  - TKA and Spine Surgeries had a odds ratio of  $< 0.01$  (protective). We believe this was due to a low amount of onboard anesthetics and enhanced operative management of anesthesia with somatosensory evoked potentials respectively.
- Further chart review and prospective analysis may be required to understand the mechanism for increased likelihood of IPR in other general and vascular procedures.
- Many of the patient comorbidities overlap with risk factors for

## Limitations

- Retrospective review of registry data is limited to data collected by the registry and may not have generalizability outside of participants in the ACS NSQIP patient registry.
- Since there is no explicit variable for IPR, it was inferred by exclusions. Further chart review at an institutional level may be necessary to validate the application of the se exclusions for this purpose.

## Next Steps

- Perform institutional review of IPR events and compare to national trends and benchmarks. This will allow us to better understand:
  - Interplay and overlap of underlying etiologies.
  - Cost an average IPR event.
- Combining the identified risk factors with physiologic parameters during emergence from anesthesia to help develop a high risk pulmonary pathway in the immediate perioperative period.
  - Traditionally, neostigmine has been used to promote anesthesia reversal in high risk patients
  - New, novel neuromuscular blockade reversal agents have demonstrated more effective at reversing the neuromuscular blockade than neostigmine, albeit at a higher price.
  - As the price for neostigmine rises, and becomes more comparable to these new agents, it may become beneficial to treat high risk groups, such as the ones identified in our study, with the newer agents.
- Develop and validate robust anesthesia and surgery outcomes.
  - Many outcomes require appropriate patient selection, pre-operative optimization, and intra-operative management by anesthesia.
  - Outcomes such as IPR require close coordination and collaboration between anesthesia and surgery.
  - Sharing and benchmarking outcomes like these may help to promote collaboration for improved outcomes in these two specialties

## References

1. Dimick JB, Chen SL, Taheri P a, et al. Hospital costs associated with surgical complications: a report from the private-sector National Surgical Quality Improvement Program. *J. Am. Coll. Surg.* 2004;199:531-7. doi:10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2004.05.276.
2. Alvarez MP, Samayoa-Mendez AX, Naglak MC, et al. Risk Factors for Postoperative Unplanned Intubation: Analysis of a National Database. *Am. Surg.* 2015;81:820-825.
3. Milgrom DP, Njoku VC, Fecher AM, et al. Unplanned intubation: when and why does this deadly complication occur? *Surgery* 2013;154:376-83. doi:10.1016/j.surg.2013.05.006.
4. Craft J. Patient-controlled analgesia: Is it worth the painful prescribing process? *Proc. Bayl. Univ. Med. Cent.* 2010;23:434-438.