A Novel Barrier Device and Method for Protection against Airborne Pathogens During Endotracheal Intubation

Running Head: A Novel Barrier Device for Endotracheal Intubation.

Julio M. Alonso M.D.^{1,2}, Jeffrey Lipman M.D., Ph.D.^{2,3,4}, Kiran Shekar M.D., Ph.D.^{1,5}

¹ Adult Intensive Care Services and Critical Care Research Group, The Prince Charles Hospital, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

² The University of Queensland, Brisbane. Queensland, Australia

³ Jamieson Trauma Institute and Intensive Care Services, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Brisbane

⁴ Nimes University Hospital, University of Montpellier, Nimes, France

⁵ Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane; University of Queensland, Brisbane; and Bond University, Gold Coast. Queensland, Australia

Address correspondence to:

Dr Julio M Alonso.

Adult Intensive Care Services. The Prince Charles Hospital.

Rode Road. Chermside West. QLD 4032. Australia

Phone: +61 434 940 786

E-mail: j.alonsobabarro@uq.edu.au

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Background**

3 The risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission to healthcare workers increases during aerosol-
4 generating procedures such as endotracheal intubation.

5 **Objectives**

6 We tested the effectiveness of a novel barrier mouthpiece in reducing clinician exposure
7 to aerosols and droplets during endotracheal intubation.

8 **Design**

9 A prospective case control study was carried out, with a single operator performing
10 eight simulated intubations with and without the device on two different high-fidelity
11 manikin models which produced aerosols and droplets.

12 **Setting**

13 The study was performed during June 2020, at the Clinical Skills Development Service,
14 Brisbane, Australia.

15 **Interventions**

16 Simulated scenarios included 1) intubation during cardiopulmonary resuscitation 2)
17 intubation while pre-oxygenating via high flow nasal cannula. Photographic images
18 were obtained during each intubation and digitally analyzed using ImageJ v2.1.0/1.53c.

19 **Patients**

20 Not applicable.

21 **Main outcome measures**

22 Aerosol and droplets were quantified using pixel counts. Overall results were expressed
23 as means ($\pm$ SD), with comparisons between groups made using a two-tailed Student's
24 T-test under the assumption of unequal variances. A P value of ≤ 0.05 was considered
25 as statistically significant.

26 **Results**

27 First pass intubation was achieved in all scenarios, with and without the barrier device.
28 Pixel counts demonstrated significant overall reduction in aerosol and droplet exposure
29 when the barrier device was used during intubation [Mean (SD) count:509 (860) vs

10169 (11600); $P=0.014$]. The highest exposure risk to airborne particles was observed during simulated induction, prior to laryngoscopy and intubation.

Conclusions

The novel barrier device was effective in reducing environmental exposure to aerosols and droplets during intubation without negatively affecting first pass intubation. The highest risk of exposure to airborne particles was during induction, before intubation takes place. Clinical trials are indicated to further test the feasibility and efficacy of this device.

Trial registration

Not applicable.

Keywords: Endotracheal intubation, SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, Prevention, Safety

42 KEY POINTS

- 43 • This prospective, preclinical study represents a pilot trial of a novel barrier
44 mouthpiece for reducing clinician exposure to aerosols and droplets during
45 endotracheal intubation.
- 46 • In eight simulated intubations with and without the barrier mouthpiece, the
47 device proved effective in reducing environmental exposure to aerosols and
48 droplets (measured in pixels) during intubation, without negatively affecting
49 first pass intubation.
- 50 • The novel barrier mouthpiece represents a possible solution for reducing the risk
51 of respiratory pathogen transmission during endotracheal intubation without
52 hampering the procedure itself, although larger preclinical and clinical trials are
53 necessary.

54

55 **Background**

56 From December 2019 - when the first cases of novel SARS-CoV-2 infection were
 57 described¹ - to May 2020 alone, over 152,888 healthcare workers had already been
 58 infected by the virus², accounting for up to 17.2% of hospital admissions (including
 59 healthcare workers' households) for COVID-19³. Subsequent studies have confirmed
 60 that COVID-19 is an airborne disease^{4,5}, pointing to an increased risk of transmission
 61 during aerosol generating procedures such as cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) or
 62 endotracheal intubation (ETI), a procedure performed in up to 20% of severely ill
 63 patients with COVID-19⁶. Worldwide shortages of personal protective equipment
 64 (PPE), especially in under-resourced environments and developing countries, have led
 65 to increased concerns about inequalities regarding access to necessary protection for
 66 healthcare workers during this and other procedures⁷. On the other hand, PPE itself
 67 may not be the panacea for eliminating the risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission during
 68 aerosol-generating procedures. In their observational cohort, Boghdadly *et. al* describe
 69 around 10% incidence of COVID-19 symptoms in healthcare workers involved in the
 70 ETI of patients with the disease, despite the majority wearing adequate PPE as defined
 71 by the World Health Organization⁸.

72 To provide an extra level of protection for frontline workers during intubation of
 73 COVID-19 patients, recent publications have documented the rise of initiatives such as
 74 'intubation teams' comprising of experienced anesthesiologists^{9,10}, *ad hoc* intubation
 75 protocols¹¹, dedicated negative pressure rooms¹², and protective barrier enclosures, of
 76 which the best-known example is the 'aerosol box', designed by Dr. Hsien Yung Lai, a
 77 Taiwanese anesthesiologist¹³. Further versions of the aerosol box, including the
 78 addition of a negative-pressure chamber, have also been developed¹⁴. However, despite
 79 initial traction and widespread use in clinical practice, subsequent studies in simulation
 80 models and clinical practice¹⁵ have provided evidence that these devices could pose a
 81 risk for patient safety, due to increased intubation times¹⁶. In addition, these devices
 82 may hamper access to the airway, and may paradoxically increase healthcare worker
 83 infection rates because of increased exposure to aerosols during removal of the barrier
 84 enclosure¹⁷. These findings led to the FDA withdrawing its Emergency Use Approval
 85 for protective barrier enclosures in August 2020.

86 To the best of our knowledge, no current alternative to protective barrier enclosures
 87 exists that offers an extra layer of protection for physicians and their teams during
 88 intubation of patients with COVID-19 or other respiratory infections, while ensuring
 89 correct access to the airway and guaranteeing the feasibility of the procedure. Therefore,
 90 we designed a barrier mouthpiece – the Airway ShieldTM - which restricts the spread of
 91 aerosols and droplets during the endotracheal intubation procedure by covering the
 92 patient’s mouth, while facilitating intubation itself via a cannula that is inserted between
 93 the patient’s tongue and the palate, allowing the introduction of the laryngoscope’s
 94 blade and the endotracheal tube, and guiding the endotracheal tube towards the larynx.

95 The objective of our study is to evaluate the effectiveness of this novel device regarding
 96 the reduction of aerosols and droplets liberated during ETI, compared to conventional
 97 intubation without the device. Secondary objectives include assessing the feasibility of
 98 endotracheal intubation with the device, measured as first pass intubation, and
 99 quantifying the risk of aerosol and droplet spread in different moments of the procedure.

100

101 **Methods**

102 The study was carried out at the Clinical Skills Development Service (CSDS) in
103 Brisbane, Australia, during June 2020. This institution provides simulation-based
104 training for healthcare professionals from the Queensland Health workforce and offers a
105 large range of devices and venues for preclinical research.

106 The study was designed to evaluate Airway Shield's efficacy in reducing droplet
107 (airborne particles $> 5\mu\text{m}$ in diameter) and aerosol (airborne particles $< 5\mu\text{m}$ in
108 diameter)¹⁸ exposure when performing ETI during CPR and during controlled ETI
109 while maintaining oxygenation with High Flow Nasal Canula (HFNC), with and
110 without Airway Shield. High-fidelity simulated ETIs were performed on manikins
111 capable of producing droplets and aerosols. Imaging software (ImageJ) was used to
112 measure and compare the spread of droplets and aerosols in the different scenarios.

113 **Ethics**

114 Our study was carried out in accordance with the ethical principles set out in the
115 Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical approval for this study was not required as no animals
116 or human patients were involved.

117 **Device characteristics**

118 The device tested in this study was a 3-D printed prototype, built in medical grade TPU
119 material with a Shore A hardness durometer scale of 80, specifically chosen to give a
120 consistency that maintains and recovers its form, while being soft enough to avoid
121 damage of the mucosa of a patient when introduced through the mouth and placed
122 between the palate and the tongue (Figures 1, 2 and 3). This novel barrier device has
123 three main components: A shield, to cover the patient's mouth; a working channel, with
124 two openings, a proximal one, at the level of the shield, and a distal one at the other end;
125 and a seal, to cover the proximal opening and restrict aerosol spread while permitting
126 the insertion of the blade of a laryngoscope and the endotracheal tube through it.
127 Additionally, two small, sealed openings at both sides of the main proximal opening at
128 the level of the shield, provide access for catheters for the suction of fluids or aerosols
129 during ETI (Figures 1 and 2).

130 **Technique of intubation with the novel device**

131 Endotracheal intubation with the Airway Shield is performed in 3 steps. First, during
132 induction, the device is placed: the working channel is introduced into the mouth of the
133 patient following the palate, until the shield covers the mouth. Second, ETI is
134 performed: as in a standard ETI, the video-laryngoscope blade is introduced first to
135 obtain a view of the larynx, followed by the ETT (endotracheal tube), in this case
136 following the blade through the working channel, towards the larynx. Finally, the
137 Airway Shield is removed: once the ETT is in place and the ventilator is connected, the
138 device is peeled away from the midline and removed. (Figure 3 and Additional File 2:
139 multimedia content).

140 **Manikin preparation**

141 For this study, we designed two different manikin models to produce aerosols and
142 droplets. To simulate and evaluate the spread of aerosols during the intubation
143 procedure, a resuscitation manikin (Megacode Kelly, Laerdal) was modified by
144 connecting a nebulizer (Aerogen Solo, Aerogen) for inhalation to the reservoir bag of a
145 self-inflating bag connected to the lungs, and powered by a ventilator (Servo U,
146 Maquet), thus permitting the nebulization of an ultraviolet light-sensitive fluid into the
147 simulated airway. Continuous airflow (6L/minute) was applied to the nebulizer to
148 ensure sufficient aerosol visualization. To evaluate the spread of droplets, an atomizer
149 connected by a long tubing to a syringe containing colored fluid (green dye mixed with
150 water) was placed at the level of the manikin's oropharynx, pointing towards the mouth
151 (Additional File 1: Manikin Preparation).

152 **Simulated endotracheal intubation**

153 We tested the device for the environmental exposure of both aerosols and droplets in
154 two different scenarios – intubation during cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and
155 intubation during oxygenation with high flow nasal cannula (HFNC) – and compared
156 the results with those obtained in the same scenarios during conventional intubation. A
157 total of eight simulated intubations were performed by a single operator, with first pass
158 intubation recorded as a dichotomous variable (yes/no). The same sequence of
159 simulations was followed for the scenarios evaluating the spread of droplets. (Further
160 documentation on the complete sequence of events is available in Appendix C and D)

161 During the simulations, photographs were taken at a rate of 6 frames per second to
162 capture data on the spread of aerosols and droplets at three moments of each simulated

163 clinical scenario: just before introduction of the laryngoscope into the manikin's mouth
164 (corresponding to anesthetic induction); during initial laryngoscopy; and during the
165 introduction of the endotracheal tube. The spread of aerosols and droplets was
166 documented by photographs taken from a fixed angle against a dark background. In
167 order to quantify and compare results, the photograph showing the highest spread of
168 aerosols and droplets was chosen for each scenario. All photographs measured 1920 x
169 1280 pixels.

170 **Data analysis**

171 Images from each scenario were selected according to the maximum count of droplets
172 or aerosols in each setting and were converted from color to black and white in order to
173 permit digital analysis. A manual polygonal selection of the areas in which aerosols and
174 droplets were visualized was carried out. Captured data were analyzed with detection
175 and automatic count of aerosols and droplets using ImageJ v2.1.0/1.53c, an open-source
176 package for the processing and analysis of scientific images.

177 Aerosol and droplets were quantified using pixel counts. Overall results were expressed
178 as means ($\pm$ SD), with the comparison between groups made using a two-tailed
179 Student's T-test under the assumption of unequal variances. A P value of 0.05 or less
180 was considered to indicate statistical significance. Statistical analysis of the results was
181 carried out using R version 4.1.0 (© 2021 The R Foundation for Statistical Computing).

182

183

184 **Results**

185

186 24 images were selected for digital analysis using automatic pixel counts (Figures 4 and
187 5 and Additional File 3), after previous manual selection of the area in which aerosols
188 or droplets had been detected. Pixel counts demonstrated significant overall reduction of
189 aerosols and droplets during ETI in high-fidelity clinical simulations with Airway
190 Shield compared to intubation without the device (509 (859.96) vs 10168.91
191 (11600.63); $P=0.014$), as shown in Table 1. When analyzed by subgroups (Table 2),
192 Airway Shield reduced the spread of aerosols by 12-fold on average ($P=0.045$). The
193 spread of droplets was reduced by an average of 43-fold, although this result was not
194 statistically significant.

195 First pass success was achieved in all clinical scenarios, both with and without Airway
196 Shield. The operator did not describe difficulty while carrying out the procedure in any
197 of the simulated intubation scenarios.

198 Regarding the risk of aerosol and droplet spread during the different moments of the
199 endotracheal intubation procedure, highest counts of airborne particles were observed
200 during simulated induction, before carrying out initial laryngoscopy and intubation
201 (Figure 6). This difference was maintained in both CPR and HFNC scenarios,
202 independently of whether Airway Shield was used.

203

204 **Discussion**

205

206 The primary objective of our study was to test Airway Shield's potential for reducing
207 the spread of aerosols and droplets during ETI, as compared to intubation without the
208 device. We simulated clinical scenarios in specifically designed manikin models and
209 used automatic pixel counts as a surrogate marker of the reduction in spread of droplets
210 and aerosols generated by patients in real-life settings. Our results showed that this
211 novel barrier mouthpiece demonstrated significant overall reduction of airborne
212 particles, while permitting a consistent first pass success rate in all simulated
213 intubations. These findings confirm Airway Shield's effectiveness as a barrier device
214 against aerosols and droplets, while at the same time permitting successful ETI.

215 Our results offer a novel perspective on barrier devices designed to reduce exposure to
216 airborne particles during intubation. This study is the first to present a specifically
217 designed mouthpiece which demonstrates effective protection from aerosols and
218 droplets while permitting successful ETI. The novelty of this device stems from the fact
219 that it successfully covers the patient's mouth without impeding first pass intubation.

220 Regarding the risk of aerosol and droplet spread during the different moments of the
221 endotracheal intubation procedure, our study demonstrated a consistently higher count
222 of airborne particles during induction in all but one scenario. To our knowledge, this
223 study is the first to address the risk of exposure to aerosols and droplets at specific
224 moments of the procedure. Although the number of experiments is too small to permit
225 statistical comparison, we raise the hypothesis that induction may be the moment of
226 highest risk for healthcare professionals carrying out the intubation procedure.

227 Our study has four main limitations. First, it is a preclinical study in manikin models,
228 using pixel counts as surrogate markers for the aerosols and droplets generated by
229 patients during ETI. Second, the possibility of small variations in the flow of aerosols
230 and droplets produced by the manikins cannot be completely eliminated. Third, the
231 manual polygon selection process may affect reproducibility of the results. Finally, the
232 number of simulated scenarios is relatively small; however, the variations in aerosol and
233 droplet spread are large enough to permit statistically significant conclusions.

234 **Conclusions**

235 Our study suggests that Airway Shield, a novel barrier mouthpiece, is effective in
 236 reducing the spread of aerosols and droplets during ETI, while permitting successful
 237 first pass intubation. The results offer a novel perspective on barrier devices and open
 238 the door to the possibility of using a mouthpiece to protect healthcare workers during
 239 ETI, an aerosol generating procedure. Our findings also generate the hypothesis that the
 240 moment of highest risk of exposure to airborne particles is, in fact, during induction,
 241 before the actual intubation takes place.

242 Further research is necessary to confirm these findings, including larger simulation
 243 studies and clinical trials to evaluate safety and efficacy of Airway Shield.

244

245 **Acknowledgements relating to this article:**

246

247 **Assistance with the article:**

248 The authors would like to thank the ‘Clinical Skills Development Service’ in Brisbane
 249 and Clinton Henderson for their contribution setting up the manikins used for the study,
 250 Cambell Smyth for his contribution in the CAD design of the device and the drawings
 251 presented in this article, Joanne Zuo for her contribution with the digital data analysis,
 252 Jose Medrano for his suggestions for the design of the study, and Sergio Lordao and
 253 Michael Minoza for their contribution taking the photos and video.

254

255 **Financial support and sponsorship:** None

256 **Conflicts of interest:** J.M.A. has created the concept and design of the Airway
 257 Shield™ and has filed an international patent for commercial use. J.L. and K.S. have no
 258 conflicts of interest to declare.

259

260 **Presentations:** None

261

262

263 **References**

- 264 1. Ge H, Wang X, Yuan X, et al. The epidemiology and clinical information about
265 COVID-19. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2020;39(6):1011–9.
- 266 2. Bandyopadhyay S, Baticulon RE, Kadhun M, et al. Infection and mortality of
267 healthcare workers worldwide from COVID-19: a systematic review. *BMJ Glob*
268 *Health*. 2020;5(12):e003097.
- 269 3. Shah AS, Wood R, Gribben C, et al. Risk of hospital admission with coronavirus
270 disease 2019 in healthcare workers and their households: nationwide linkage
271 cohort study. *BMJ*. 2020;371:m3582
- 272 4. Wilson NM, Marks GB, Eckhardt A, et al. The effect of respiratory activity,
273 non-invasive respiratory support and facemasks on aerosol generation and its
274 relevance to COVID-19. *Anaesthesia* [online ahead of print] 30 March 2021;
275 [https://associationofanaesthetists-](https://associationofanaesthetists-publications.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/anae.15475)
276 [publications.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/anae.15475](https://associationofanaesthetists-publications.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/anae.15475)
- 277 5. Weissman DN, De Perio MA, Radonovich LJ. COVID-19 and risks posed to
278 personnel during endotracheal intubation. *JAMA*. 2020;323(20):2027–8.
- 279 6. Halpern NA, Tan KS. United States resource availability for COVID-19. *Critical*
280 *Care Statistics*. 2020. [https://sccm.org/Blog/March-2020/United-States-Resource-](https://sccm.org/Blog/March-2020/United-States-Resource-Availability-for-COVID-19?_zs=jxpjd1&_zl=w9pb6)
281 [Availability-for-COVID-19?_zs=jxpjd1&_zl=w9pb6](https://sccm.org/Blog/March-2020/United-States-Resource-Availability-for-COVID-19?_zs=jxpjd1&_zl=w9pb6). Accessed 27 JUL 2021.
- 282 7. Minayo MC de S, Freire NP. The pandemic exacerbates health inequalities. *Cien*
283 *Saude Colet*. 2020;25:3555–6.
- 284 8. El-Boghdadly K, Wong DJN, Owen R, et al. Risks to healthcare workers following
285 tracheal intubation of patients with COVID-19: a prospective international
286 multicentre cohort study. *Anaesthesia*. 2020;75(11):1437–47.
- 287 9. Cook TM, El-Boghdadly K, McGuire B, McNarry AF, Patel A, Higgs A. Consensus
288 guidelines for managing the airway in patients with COVID-19: Guidelines from
289 the Difficult Airway Society, the Association of Anaesthetists the Intensive Care

- 290 Society, the Faculty of Intensive Care Medicine and the Royal College of
291 Anaesthetists. *Anaesthesia*. 2020;75(6):785–99.
- 292 10. Gandhi A, Sokhi J, Lockie C, Ward PA. Emergency tracheal intubation in patients
293 with COVID-19: experience from a UK Centre. *Anesthesiology research and*
294 *practice*. [Serial online] 2020 Dec [Cited 2021 Jul 27]. Available from:
295 <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/arp/2020/8816729/>
- 296 11. Miller L, Luković E, Wagener G. Guiding airway management and personal
297 protective equipment for COVID-19 intubation teams. *Br J Anaesth*.
298 2020;125(3):e288–90.
- 299 12. Matava CT, Kovatsis PG, Summers JL, et al. Pediatric airway management in
300 Coronavirus disease 2019 patients: consensus guidelines from the society for
301 pediatric anesthesia's pediatric difficult intubation collaborative and the Canadian
302 pediatric anesthesia society. *Anesth Analg* [Online ahead of print] 13 Apr 2020;
303 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7173403/>
- 304 13. Malik JS, Jenner C, Ward PA. Maximising application of the aerosol box in
305 protecting healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Anaesthesia*.
306 2020;75(7):974.
- 307 14. Gupta V, Sahani A, Mohan B, Wander GS. Negative pressure aerosol containment
308 box: An innovation to reduce COVID-19 infection risk in healthcare workers. *J*
309 *Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol*. 2020;36(Suppl 1):S144.
- 310 15. Tighe NT, McClain CD, Vlassakova BG, et al. Aerosol barriers in pediatric
311 anesthesiology: Clinical data supports FDA caution. *Pediatr Anaesth*.
312 2021;31(4):461–4.
- 313 16. Lim ZJ, Reddy MP, Karalapillai D, Shekar K, Subramaniam A. The impact of an
314 aerosol box on time to tracheal intubation: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br*
315 *J Anaesth*. 2021; 126(3):e122-e125
- 316 17. Begley JL, Lavery KE, Nickson CP, Brewster DJ. The aerosol box for intubation in
317 coronavirus disease 2019 patients: an in situ simulation crossover study.
318 *Anaesthesia*. 2020;75(8):1014–21.

- 319 18. Fennelly KP. Particle sizes of infectious aerosols: implications for infection control.
320 The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. 2020; 8(9): 914-924
321

322 **Table Legends**

323 Table 1: Aerosol and droplet count in high-fidelity clinical simulations of endotracheal
324 intubation (ETI)

325 Table 2: Overall comparison of aerosol and droplet counts

326

327 **Figure Legends:**

328 Figure 1A: Components of the Airway Shield™ barrier mouthpiece device; Front view.

329 Figure 1B: Components of the Airway Shield™ barrier mouthpiece device; Rear view.

330 Figure 1C: Components of the Airway Shield™ barrier mouthpiece device; Right side
331 view.

332 Figure 2: Functional position of the Airway Shield™: Working channel allocated
333 between the tongue and the palate; shield covering the patient's mouth

334 Figure 3A: Endotracheal intubation with the aid of the Airway Shield™: Insertion.

335 Figure 3B: Endotracheal intubation with the aid of the Airway Shield™: Laryngoscopy.

336 Figure 3C: Endotracheal intubation with the aid of the Airway Shield™: Intubation.

337 Figure 4: Simulated induction during ETI and CPR in aerosol manikin model.

338 Figure 5: Simulated induction during ETI with HFNC oxygenation in droplet manikin
339 models.

340 Figure 6: Risk of aerosol and droplet spread during different moments of the intubation
341 procedure. Aerosol and droplet counts, in pixels, are depicted in the logarithmic scale.

342

343 **Additional Files**

344 Additional File 1: Manikin Preparation

345 Additional File 2: Multimedia Content

346 Additional File 3: Dataset with all 24 shots from the 8 simulated scenarios during CPR

347 and HFNC in droplet and aerosol manikin models performed for the study. Figures with

348 original color photos, black and white photos, and digital pixel counts.

349

Table 1

Aerosol and droplet count in high-fidelity clinical simulations of endotracheal intubation (ETI)

Scenario	Manikin model	With Airway Shield™	Without Airway Shield™
ETI† during CPR	Aerosol	3047	24001
- induction			
ETI during CPR	Aerosol	850	7324
- initial laryngoscopy			
ETI during CPR	Aerosol	655	8694
- intubation			
ETI and oxygenation with HFNC	Aerosol	0	9308
- induction			
ETI and oxygenation with HFNC	Aerosol	23	2618
- initial laryngoscopy			
ETI and oxygenation with HFNC	Aerosol	0	3256
- intubation			
ETI during CPR	Droplet	616	21919

- induction			
ETI during CPR	Droplet	616	7178
– initial laryngoscopy			
ETI during CPR	Droplet	206	583
– intubation			
ETI and oxygenation with Droplet HFNC		78	37142
– induction			
ETI and oxygenation with Droplet HFNC		1	2
– initial laryngoscopy			
ETI and oxygenation with Droplet HFNC		16	2
– intubation			
Mean ($\pm$ SD)		509	10168.91
		(859.96) *	(11600.63) *

Results are measured in pixels. *P=0.015. †ETI, endotracheal intubation; CPR, cardiopulmonary resuscitation; HFNC, high-flow nasal prongs; SD, standard deviation.

Table 2

Overall comparison of aerosol and droplet counts

Manikin model	With Airway Shield TM	Without Airway Shield TM
Aerosol	762.5 (1178.79) *	9200.16 (7765.44) *
Droplet	255.5 (288.45)	11137.67 (15281.02)
Total	509 (859.96) *	10168.91 (11600.63) *

Results are measured in pixels. *P<0.05.

Figure 1A

Figure 1B

Figure 1C

1. Shield
2. Working channel
3. Seal of the proximal opening of the working channel
4. Distal opening of the working channel
5. Suction ports
6. Line for peel-off removal

Figure 2

Figure 3A

Figure 3B

Figure 3C

Figure 4

Result:

	Slice	Count	Total Area	Average Size
①	Scenario 1.1.jpg	1104	24001	21.740
②	Scenario 2.1.jpg	28	3047	108.821

Count = number of areas
 Total Area = total size of all areas
 Average Size = average size of each area
 (Unit of area: PIXEL)

Figure 5

Size of the picture is 1920x1280 pixels

Result:

	Slice	Count	Total Area	Average Size
①	Scenario 5.1.jpg	1126	21919	19.466
②	Scenario 6.1.JPG	87	616	7.080

(Unit of area: PIXEL)

Count = number of areas
Total Area = total size of all areas
Average Size = average size of each area

Figure 6