Resuscitation of Choking Victims in a Pediatric Population Using a Novel Portable Non-Powered Suction Device: Real-World Data

Laura Levinson Gal*, Pamela Pugliesi, Diane Peterman
ProHEALTH Whitestone Pediatrics, NewYork, USA

ABSTRACT

Background: Foreign body aspiration remains a significant cause of pediatric morbidity and mortality. This study aimed to assess the use of a novel, portable, nonpowered suction device (The LifeVac; LifeVac LLC, New York, USA) in pediatric patients who experience a choking emergency, and for whom standard resuscitative protocols have failed.

Methods: This article provides a summary of self-reported instances of use in pediatric patients during real-world choking emergencies that occurred from January 2014 to July 2020.

Results: Over a 6-year period, a total of 21 pediatric patients recovered from a choking incident after using the device to remove the airway obstruction when standard resuscitative protocols failed. No long-term complications were reported.

Conclusion: These cases describe the successful use of the device in pediatric patients who experienced a choking emergency. This study is limited by a reliance on user-reported data; although no device failures have been reported to date, we cannot definitively declare that they have not occurred. Based on these findings, and the data collected from adult subjects, use of this device during choking emergencies should be studied further.

Keywords: Aspiration; Aerodigestive tract; Foreign body airway obstruction; Anti-choking apparatus; Suffocation risks; Pre-hospital

INTRODUCTION

The process of swallowing involves complex coordination of oropharyngeal skeletal muscles [1]. While a number of neurological and musculoskeletal conditions predispose patients to oropharyngeal dysphagia and increase choking risk, such as Down syndrome and cerebral palsy, children younger than 3 years old are merely at-risk due to an underdeveloped swallowing reflex [2]. The majority of choking-related incidents in children are associated with food, coins, or toys [3]. In pediatric patients 75% of foreign body aspiration occurs in patients under 3 years old, with the majority of these cases occurring during the third year of life [4]. Incidentally, male children are more likely to aspirate foreign bodies than female children [5]. Despite being a preventable condition, morbidity and mortality due to foreign body aspiration in pediatric patients remains a clinical concern. The primary cause of accidental infant mortality is due to the inhalation of foreign bodies; in children under 5 years old, it is the 4th leading cause of accidental death [6]. A child dies every 5 days in the United States by choking on food [7]. Since death due to choking can occur in under 5 minutes, rapid and effective intervention is necessary to increase chance of survival [8].

A maneuver that applies upward thrusts to the epigastrium to force an obstruction out of the airway was developed in 1974 to remove airway obstruction [9]. The current American Heart Association choking protocol for babies under 1 year of age suggests alternating 5 back blows and 5 chest compressions to remove the foreign body, with a progression to rescue breaths and chest compressions if the infant loses consciousness [10]. In children over 1 year old, alternating 5 back blows and 5 abdominal thrusts progressing to Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation (CPR) if the child becomes unresponsive is also recommended [10]. However, what happens when these maneuvers do not remove the obstruction? Rescue breaths may force the foreign body further into the airway, and back blows and abdominal thrusts are not feasible in wheelchair-bound choking victims. Magill forceps have successfully removed foreign body airway obstructions, but since this is an invasive tool their use is limited to those with advanced medical training [11]. At present, a portable, non-invasive device that requires minimal training to assist a choking victim has not been readily available.

A simple-to-use, lightweight, portable, non-invasive, non-powered...
suction device for resuscitation of a choking victim has been developed (Figure 1). The device consists of a patented plunger attached to a one-way valve which, in turn, attaches to a standard face mask that covers the nose and mouth. The unit includes a pediatric face mask as well as an adult face mask. When the plunger is depressed, air is forced out the sides and not into the victim. Pulling back on the plunger applies suction, which removes the foreign body from the airway (Figure 2). In a laboratory setting the device generates an average of 333.16 mmHg of suction force when the plunger is pulled back [12]. Creating 3 times the force of a standard cough [13]. In a study conducted in healthy, conscious, nonobese men, the standard tactics used to resuscitate choking victims circumferential abdominal thrusts, the classic abdominal thrust-based maneuver, a self-administered abdominal thrust, and a self-administered chair thrust generated forces ranging from 22 cm H2O to 138 cm H2O (16.18 mmHg to 101.51 mmHg) [14]. This article summarizes user-reported implementation of this novel device to remove foreign body airway obstructions in pediatric choking victims around the world.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Since its release in 2014 The LifeVac (LifeVac LLC, New York, United States [US]) has been distributed in countries around the world including the US, Greece, Australia, Israel, the United Kingdom, and Spain (LifeVac LLC data). Each unit comes with a feedback card that can be mailed to the company, or a feedback card that directs the user to a website form that encourages users to report back on their user experience, including any complications that are encountered (Figure 3) [15]. The website has instructions for use as well as a training video [16] LifeVac, LLC has documented reported uses of the device as part of an internal monitoring study. The results of self-reported resuscitation efforts using the device in pediatric patients are summarized and reviewed below. Preliminary pediatric data, coupled with adult data, were presented as a poster at The World Congress of Gastroenterology at The American College of Gastroenterology in October 2017 [17]. Data of use in

![Figure 1: The device attached to a standard adult facemask.](image1)
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Table 1: Data summary for choking in pediatric population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (y, m)</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Medical condition</th>
<th>Location of event</th>
<th>Person using device</th>
<th>Objects (s) removed</th>
<th>Number of attempts with device</th>
<th>BLS protocol attempted first</th>
<th>Conscious when device used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 y M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Down syndrome</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Hot dog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 y M</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Chopped baby carrots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 m F</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Plastic wrapper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 y M</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Candy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 y M</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Coins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 y M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dup15 syndrome</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Peanut butter and bread</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 y M</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Cured ham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 m M</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Chopped tuna and pasta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 y M</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Unknown*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 y M</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Cereal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 m F</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Orange slice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 m M</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Popcorn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Mucus/phlegm/vomitus</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 m F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sotos syndrome</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Vomitus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 y M</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Solid food</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 y F</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 y F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cerebral palsy, microcephaly</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Hamburger</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 y F</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Strawberry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 y F</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Leaf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 y F</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Sausage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 y F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Whole grape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adult patients who were predisposed to oropharyngeal dysphagia will be reported separately.

RESULTS

Between January 2014 and 2020 there have been 22 reports submitted of use in pediatric subjects. We have included 21 of these cases in this report; although the 22nd case demonstrated a successful save using the device, the patient was 3 weeks of age and below the recommended minimal weight of 22 pounds [18]. Data from the 21 cases are summarized in Table 1. The subject’s ages ranged from 11 months to 13 years old, with a mean age of 3.4 years. One patient’s age was unreported but was described to be rescued in her car seat, so it is assumed that she is a pediatric case. In this dataset, 52.4% of patients were male. The majority of the subjects had no underlying medical conditions that predisposed them to oropharyngeal dysphagia, other than young age. However, patients with Down syndrome (n=1), duplication of chromosome 15 (n=1), cerebral palsy with microcephaly (n=1), and Sotos syndrome (n=1) were included in this summary. Reported foreign objects recovered included coins, popcorn, fruit, mucus, tuna, ham, peanut butter and bread, candy, plastic, hot dog, hamburger, strawberry, sausage, a leaf, a whole grape, and carrots. In 20 out of 21 cases, parents deployed the device; a security team member at an airport used it on the remaining patient. In each case the user(s) reported administering some form of Basic Life Support (BLS) protocol, which did not remove the obstructing object, before using the device. The foreign body was successfully removed by the device in all instances. The device was applied more than once in the majority of cases, resulting in at least 24 device implementations. In most cases (n=19) 1 or 2 deployments were successful in dislodging the foreign body. Three attempts were necessary to remove the obstructing object in 2 cases. No serious side effects were reported, and 20 patients returned to baseline health status without further medical intervention. Endoscopic surgery was required to remove 2 coins from 1 patient. The user-reported experiences with the device were all positive. One patient developed a contusion on her chin due to a vigorous placement of the facemask, but it resolved without intervention. To date there have been no reported device failures in pediatric patients. In one adult case that will be reported separately, the device successfully removed the obstruction but the patient succumbed to cardiac arrest.

DISCUSSION

Foreign body aspiration and asphyxia remains a serious clinical problem for the pediatric population, particularly in patients under 3 years of age [19-22]. Since brain damage can occur in minutes and death shortly thereafter, time is of the essence in a choking emergencies [23]. Early, pre-hospital intervention has been shown to improve outcomes in choking emergencies [24]. A retrospective study of 911 calls for choking emergencies in patients under 5 years old over a year-long period found that 59% of the emergencies were resolved by parents and caregivers prior to emergency medical services arrival [25]. Back blows and chest compressions with progression to CPR in the case of unconscious
infants, and back blows and abdominal thrusts for children with an advancement to CPR if the child is unresponsive are the current protocols [10]. Although these maneuvers have a high success rate, they can result in complications and are exceedingly difficult to employ on a wheelchair-bound patient [11,26]. If the standard choking protocols do not work, precious time is wasted waiting for emergency response teams. The average response time after a 911 call is placed ranges from about 7 to 14 minutes, making it unlikely that emergency responders could intervene before brain damage occurs in a choking victim [27]. It’s estimated that over 12,000 children under 14 years old in the US visit emergency departments due to non-fatal choking incidents each year, and the majority of those patients are under 4 years of age [28]. The overall inhospital mortality rate for pediatric patients who suffered a choking incident is estimated at 2.5% [29]. The impetus of cardiac arrest in pediatric patients is commonly due to respiratory failure [30]. The neurological outlook after cardiac arrest for pediatric patients is generally unfavourable [31-33]. Besides the risk of death from asphyxia due to an immediate complete obstruction, a partial obstruction in the lower respiratory tract can lead to distal infection and inflammatory responses that progress to complete obstruction [5].

Most cases of foreign body aspirations occur due to food consumption in both adults and children [34,35]. There are certain foods that are of higher risk of being aspirated by children based on their size, shape, and pliability [36]. In a reported case series of pediatric patients who choked on whole grapes, a review of the 1 fatal case concluded that the patient may have survived if the grape were extracted with McGill forceps in the prehospital setting [37]. However, Magill forceps are an invasive tool that requires advanced medical training and can lead to complications. Although another portable device is currently being marketed, it has a tube that must be inserted into the patient’s mouth and is therefore invasive [38]. The need for a non-invasive resuscitative aid that requires minimal training persists. This novel, portable, non-invasive suction device has been reported by users to be an effective tool during over 60 real-life choking emergencies in adults and children worldwide [39]. To date there have been no reports of significant adverse effects related to its use.

The results and interpretations from this study are limited, as it is a small, retrospective report of events that occurred and was not a prospective randomized study. However, designing a controlled, prospective study of the device in live patients presents an insurmountable ethical challenge. An animal model that suitably mimics human facial structure is also not available for testing. The need for a non-invasive resuscitative aid that requires minimal training persists. This novel, portable, non-invasive suction device deserves further exploration as an essential tool for use during choking emergencies.
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