

Effectiveness of Twill Technique Vs Endotracheal Tube Holder on ETT Securement: A Comparative Study

Kapil Sharma^{1*}, Amrit Kaur², Babita Rani³, Sunil Singh⁴, P.L. Gautam⁵

Abstract

Endotracheal intubation is an urgent procedure which is performed on patients who are unconscious and can't breathe by their own. Endotracheal Intubation keeps an airway open and helps to prevent choking. When the patient is intubated, maintaining the endotracheal tube placement is essential. In case Endotracheal Tube is not secured, even basic nursing management can cause tubing slippage which is a major factor in causing airway trauma or injuries Aim: To assess the effect of Twill Technique vs Endotracheal Tube Holder on Endotracheal Tube Securement [ETTS] Outcomes among orally intubated patients admitted in ICUs. Methodology: A post-test only control group design (two experimental groups) was used to assess the effect of Twill Technique vs Endotracheal Tube Holder on Endotracheal Tube Securement [ETTS] Outcomes among orally intubated patients. Results: The findings showed that for general assessment, it was found that statistically significant results were found between two experimental groups in GCS on day 2 ($p=0.017$), in P/F ratio on day1 ($p=0.004$). But most of the observations were statistically non-significant. Conclusion: Hence, Endotracheal Tube Holder can be recommended for Endotracheal Tube security in clinical practice.

Keywords: Twill Technique, Endotracheal Tube Holder, Endotracheal Tube Securement [ETTS] Outcomes, orally intubated patients, nursing management

INTRODUCTION

It is very important that the position of ETT should be stable for several reasons ie. To ensure proper ventilation and continuous supply of oxygen and endotracheal tube movement within the trachea may cause tracheal injury or trauma, which is main source of discomfort to the patients added several clinical

concerns with respect to patient safety when attempting to achieve a stable and secured endotracheal tube. These include avoiding the endotracheal tube from slipping, avoiding unintended extubating, and preserving the integrity of the skin on the face and neck. Endotracheal tubes should be placed between 2.5 and 4 cm above carina when assessed fiber optically [1–6]. Slippage is the extent of endotracheal tube movement within the stabilization technique. If the ETT migrates or shifts more than 1 cm, the endotracheal tube fixation needs to be replaced. To ensure Endotracheal tube stabilization and retain a clear airway and avoid complications, intensive care doctors have employed a variety of techniques One of the biggest concerns is consequently to avoid endotracheal tube movement. There is several methods available to secure endotracheal tubes. The traditional methods are those using cloth tape or adhesive tape with several techniques existing for each. Endotracheal

*Author for Correspondence

Kapil Sharma

E-mail: kapilsharma2609@gmail.com

¹Associate Professor, Department of Medical Surgical Nursing, Dayanand Medical College & Hospital, CON, Ludhiana, Punjab, India

²Advance Nurse Practitioner, Department of Medical Surgical Nursing, Dayanand Medical College & Hospital, Ludhiana, Punjab, India

^{3,4}Assistant Professor, Department of Medical Surgical Nursing, Dayanand Medical College & Hospital, CON, Ludhiana, Punjab, India

⁵Professor, Department of Critical Care Medicine, Dayanand Medical College & Hospital, Ludhiana, Punjab, India

Received Date: May 27, 2024

Accepted Date: June 26, 2024

Published Date: August 21, 2024

Citation: Kapil Sharma, Amrit Kaur, Babita Rani, Sunil Singh, P.L. Gautam. Effectiveness of Twill Technique Vs Endotracheal Tube Holder on ETT Securement: A Comparative Study. Research & Reviews: A Journal of Medicine. 2024; 14(2): 39–47p.

tube retaining devices available in stores are used much less frequently. Commercial fixation devices are recommended by the American Heart Association's 2005 guidelines as a solution that is as effective as taping or tying. It is recommended that unlike adhesive tape, the use of endotracheal tube fasteners to keep the tubes in place lowers the risk of outcomes that involves lip ulcers, facial skin tears, or ETT dislodgement. Several studies have given evidence that Endotracheal Tube Holder is very effective in the prevention of endotracheal tube dislodgement, lip ulcers and skin tears as compared to conventional method [7–10].

MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY

In the present study quantitative research approach and Experimental design were used. The present study was conducted in various ICUs of a tertiary care hospital. The total sample was 20 orally intubated patients admitted in Intensive Care Units, out of which 10 were in experimental group 1 and 10 were in experimental group 2. Simple random sampling technique was used for data collection [11–14].

Description of research Tool

Tool was divided into three parts:

PART A: Patient's Profile

Which is further divided into two sections:

Section-I: Socio-demographic Profile: It includes 9 items to obtain information about age (in years), gender, habitat, educational status, religion, marital status, dietary habits, occupation and socio-economic status

Section-II: Clinical Profile

It includes 8 items to obtain information about diagnosis of the patient, day of hospitalization, indication for intubation, previous history of being intubated, way of admission of the patient in the hospital, Co-morbidities, height (in cm), weight (in kg).

PART B: General Assessment

It includes three items

- GCS

Best response	9-15
Comatose client	4-8
Totally unresponsive	3

- ETT cuff pressure

Normal 22-32 mmHg

- P/F ratio

Normal ≥ 400

PARTC: Endotracheal Tube Securement [ETTS] Outcomes

Which is further divided into three sections:

Section-I: Modified Endotracheal Tube [ETT] Slippage Scale and number of resecurements

It includes

- Endotracheal Tube [ETT] depth at the lip line (in cm)
- Endotracheal Tube [ETT] slippage in outward direction (in cm)

Which is divided into 4 categories

Slippage Range (in cm)

No slippage 0-0.5 cm

Mild slippage 0.6-1 cm

Moderate slippage 1.1-1.5 cm

Severe slippage 2.1-5 cm

- Endotracheal Tube [ETT] position in mouth (Right side, Left side and middle)
- Number of re-securement (in a day)

Section-II: Modified Oral Assessment Guide (OAG) Scale for lip ulcers and oral mucosa

It includes two subscales i.e. for lip ulcers and for oral mucosa

- For lip ulcers

Score 1-smooth, pink

Score 2-dry or Cracked

Score 3-ulcerated or bleeding

- For oral mucosa

Score 1-pink and moist

Score 2-reddened or coated, no ulcers

Score 3-ulcers with or without bleeding

Two sub scale scores of Modified Oral Assessment Guide (OAG) Scale are summed to obtain overall assessment score 2 to 6

2-normal

3 to 4-moderate alterations

5 to 6-severe alterations

Section-III: Modified Facial Skin Integrity Score Tool

It includes 3 subscales i.e. For dryness, for redness and for breakdown of facial skin

For Dryness

Score 1-no dryness

Score 2-dry skin and visible scaling score 3-cracked

For Redness

Score 1-not present

Score 2-visible redness (<50% of face surface) score 3-visible redness (≥50% of face surface)

For Breakdown

Score 1-not present

Score 2-confined to small area Score 3-confined to large area

Three sub scale scores of Modified Facial Skin Integrity Score tool are summed to obtain overall assessment score 3 to 9

3-Healthy skin condition

4 to 6-Moderate skin reaction 7 to 9-Severe skin reaction

RESULTS

- As per Socio-demographic profile, the two groups i.e. experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ were statistically identical ($p>0.05$) age, gender, habitat, educational status, religion, marital status, dietary habits, occupation and socio-economic status of the orally intubated patients.
- Mean age \pm SD of experimental group₁ was 40.70 \pm 19.95, and in experimental group₂ was 57.10 \pm 14.24 and majorities were males.
- As per their Clinical Profile, the two groups i.e. experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ were statistically identical ($p>0.05$) as per their clinical profile which includes days of hospitalization, indication of intubation, previous history of being intubated, way of admission in hospital, co-morbidities, height (cm) and weight (kg) of the orally intubated patients.
- In experimental group₁, maximum patients (20%) each were having nephrological problem, neurological problem, respiratory problem and metabolic and endocrine problem and in experimental group₂, maximum patients (30%) were having neurological problem.
- In both groups i.e. in experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ maximum patients (70%) were having day of hospitalization between 1-5 days.
- In both experimental group₁ and experimental group₂, in majority of patients indication of intubation was respiratory distress 70% and 80% respectively.
- In both groups i.e. in experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ maximum patients (90%) were not previously intubated and in experimental group₁ 50% patients were having co-morbidities and in experimental group₂ maximum patients (90%) were having co-morbidities.

Table 1 depicts frequency and percentage distribution of orally intubated patients among experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ according to ETT position from day 1 to day 6.

- As per General Assessment, statistically significant result was found between experiment group₁ and experiment group₂ in GCS on day 2 ($p=0.017$) and there was no statistically significant difference in GCS on day 1 ($p=0.270$), day 3 (0.270), day 4 (0.214), day 5 (0.819) and day 6 (0.717).
- There was statistical difference between the experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ in P/F ratio on day 1 ($p=0.004$) and there was no statistical difference between the experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ in P/F ratio in observations from day 2 to day 3 ($p>0.05$).
- On day 1, in experimental group₁, Mean \pm SD of ETT depth at lip line in cm was 22.05 \pm 1.46 and in experimental group₂, Mean \pm SD was 22.20 \pm 0.79. On day 2, in experimental group₁, Mean \pm SD was 22.50 \pm 0.82 and in experimental group₂, Mean \pm SD was 22.20 \pm 0.79. On day 3, in experimental group₁, Mean \pm SD was 22.40 \pm 1.07 and in experimental group₂, Mean \pm SD was 22.25 \pm 0.86. On day 4, in experimental group₁, Mean \pm SD was 22.30 \pm 1.49 and in experimental group₂, Mean \pm SD was 22.30 \pm 0.67. On day 5, in experimental group₁, Mean \pm SD was 22.10 \pm 0.99 and in experimental group₂, Mean \pm SD was 22.36 \pm 0.80. On day 6, in experimental group₁, Mean \pm SD was 22.20 \pm 1.03 and in experimental group₂, Mean \pm SD was 22.40 \pm 0.81.

Table 2 depicts frequency and percentage distribution of orally intubated patients among experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ according No. of resecurements of ETT from day 1 to day 6

- In experimental group₁, maximum patients were having ETT slippage in outward direction (in cm) between 0-0.5 cm in all observations from day 1 to day 6 and in experimental group₂, majority of patients were having ETT slippage in outward direction (in cm) between 0-0.5 cm on day 1 and day 4. On day 2, 40% of the patients were having ETT slippage between 0-0.5 cm and 40% were having ETT slippage between 0.6-1 cm. On day 3, maximum patients were having

ETT slippage between 0.6-1 cm. On day 5 and day 6, 50% each patients were having ETT slippage between 0-0.5 cm and 50% each were having ETT slippage between 0.6-1 cm.

Table 1. Comparison of orally intubated patients among experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ according to ETT position from day 1 to day 6.

N=20

ETT position	Experimental group ₁ n ₁ =10 f(%)	Experimental group ₂ n ₂ =10 f(%)	χ^2 Statistics
<i>Day 1</i>			
Right side	8 (80.0)	8 (80.0)	4.000 df = 2 p=0.135 ^{NS}
Left side	2 (20.0)	0 (00.0)	
Middle	0 (00.0)	2 (20.0)	
<i>Day 2</i>			
Right side	8 (80.0)	8 (80.0)	4.000 df = 2 p=0.135 ^{NS}
Left side	2 (20.0)	0 (00.0)	
Middle	0 (00.0)	2 (20.0)	
<i>Day 3</i>			
Right side	9 (90.0)	8 (80.0)	3.059 df = 2 p=0.217 ^{NS}
Left side	1 (10.0)	0 (00.0)	
Middle	0 (00.0)	2 (20.0)	
<i>Day 4</i>			
Right side	8 (80.0)	8 (80.0)	4.000 df = 2 p=0.135 ^{NS}
Left side	2 (20.0)	0 (00.0)	
Middle	0 (00.0)	2 (20.0)	
<i>Day 5</i>			
Right side	8 (80.0)	8 (80.0)	4.000 df = 2 p=0.135 ^{NS}
Left side	2 (20.0)	0 (00.0)	
Middle	0 (00.0)	2 (20.0)	
<i>Day 6</i>			
Right side	8 (80.0)	8 (80.0)	4.000 df = 2 p=0.135 ^{NS}
Left side	2 (20.0)	0 (00.0)	
Middle	0 (00.0)	2 (20.0)	

*Significant, NS=Non-Significant

Table 2. Comparison of orally intubated patients among experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ according no. of resecurements of ETT from day 1 to day 6.

N=20

No. of resecurements	Experimental group ₁ n ₁ =10 f(%)	Experimental group ₂ n ₂ =10 f(%)	χ^2 Statistics
<i>Day 1</i>			
No resecurement	0 (00.0)	10 (100.0)	20.000
1 time	4 (40.0)	0 (00.0)	df=2
2 times	6 (60.0)	0 (00.0)	p=0.000*
3 times	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	
<i>Day 2</i>			
No resecurement	0 (00.0)	9 (90.0)	17.333
1 time	2 (20.0)	1 (10.0)	df=3
2 times	3 (30.0)	0 (00.0)	p=0.001*
3 times	5 (50.0)	0 (00.0)	
<i>Day 3</i>			
No resecurement	0 (00.0)	9 (90.0)	17.333
1 time	2 (20.0)	1 (10.0)	df=3

No. of resecurements	Experimental group ₁ n ₁ =10 f(%)	Experimental group ₂ n ₂ =10 f(%)	χ^2 Statistics
2 times	4 (40.0)	0 (00.0)	p=0.001*
3 times	4 (40.0)	0 (00.0)	
<i>Day 4</i>			
No resecurement	0 (00.0)	9 (90.0)	17.333
1 time	2 (20.0)	1 (10.0)	df=3
2 times	5 (50.0)	0 (00.0)	p=0.001*
3 times	3 (30.0)	0 (00.0)	
<i>Day 5</i>			
No resecurement	0 (00.0)	6 (60.0)	13.143
1 time	3 (30.0)	4 (40.0)	df=3
2 times	5 (50.0)	0 (00.0)	p=0.004*
3 times	2 (20.0)	0 (00.0)	
<i>Day 6</i>			
No resecurement	0 (00.0)	8 (80.0)	16.000
1 time	2 (20.0)	2 (20.0)	df=2
2 times	8 (80.0)	0 (00.0)	p=0.000*
3 times	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	

*significant, NS =Non-Significant

Table 3. Comparison of orally intubated patients among experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ according to Lip ulcers and oral mucosa ulcers from day 1 to day 6
N=20

Lip Ulcers and Oral Mucosa Ulcers	Experimental group ₁ n ₁ =10 f(%)	Experimental group ₂ n ₂ =10 f(%)	χ^2 Statistics
<i>Day 1</i>			
Normal	9 (90.0)	10 (100.0)	1.053
Moderate alteration	1 (10.0)	0 (00.0)	df = 1
Severe alteration	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	p=0.305 ^{NS}
<i>Day 2</i>			
Normal	9 (90.0)	10 (100.0)	1.053
Moderate alteration	1 (10.0)	0 (00.0)	df = 1
Severe alteration	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	p=0.305 ^{NS}
<i>Day 3</i>			
Normal	5 (50.0)	9 (90.0)	3.810
Moderate alteration	5 (50.0)	1 (10.0)	df = 1
Severe alteration	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	p=0.051 ^{NS}
<i>Day 4</i>			
Normal	4 (40.0)	7 (70.0)	1.818
Moderate alteration	6 (60.0)	3 (30.0)	df = 1
Severe alteration	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	p=0.178 ^{NS}
<i>Day 5</i>			
Normal	1 (10.0)	5 (50.0)	4.359
Moderate alteration	8 (80.0)	5 (50.0)	df = 2
Severe alteration	1 (10.0)	0 (00.0)	p=0.113 ^{NS}
<i>Day 6</i>			
Normal	1 (10.0)	4 (40.0)	3.086
Moderate alteration	8 (80.0)	6 (60.0)	df = 2
Severe alteration	1 (10.0)	0 (00.0)	p=0.214 ^{NS}

*Significant, NS=Non-Significant Table 3 depicts frequency and percentage distribution of orally intubated patients among experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ according to Lip ulcers and oral mucosa ulcers from day 1 to day 6.

Table 4. Comparison of orally intubated patients among experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 according to Facial skin integrity from day 1 to day 6

N=20

Facial skin integrity	Experimental group 1 n ₁ =10 f(%)	Experimental group 2 n ₂ =10 f(%)	χ^2 Statistics
<i>Day 1</i>			
Healthy skin condition	10 (100.0)	10 (100.0)	NA
Moderate skin condition	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	
Severe skin condition	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	
<i>Day 2</i>			
Healthy skin condition	10 (100.0)	10 (100.0)	NA
Moderate skin condition	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	
Severe skin condition	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	
<i>Day 3</i>			
Healthy skin condition	10 (100.0)	10 (100.0)	NA
Moderate skin condition	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	
Severe skin condition	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	
<i>Day 4</i>			
Healthy skin condition	7 (70.0)	10 (100.0)	3.529 df = 1 p=0.060 ^{NS}
Moderate skin condition	3 (30.0)	0 (00.0)	
Severe skin condition	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	
<i>Day 5</i>			
Healthy skin condition	4 (40.0)	8 (80.0)	3.333 df = 1 p=0.068 ^{NS}
Moderate skin condition	6 (60.0)	2 (20.0)	
Severe skin condition	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	
<i>Day 6</i>			
Healthy skin condition	3 (30.0)	7 (70.0)	3.200 df = 1 p=0.074 ^{NS}
Moderate skin condition	7 (70.0)	3 (30.0)	
Severe skin condition	0 (00.0)	0 (00.0)	

*Significant, NS=Non-Significant

Table 4 depicts frequency and percentage distribution of orally intubated patients among experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 according to Facial skin integrity from day 1 to day 6. There was statistically significant difference found between experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ ($p>0.05$) in number of resecurements in all observations from day 1 to day 6. Day 1 ($p=0.000$), day 2 ($p=0.001$), day 3 ($p=0.001$), day 4 ($p=0.001$), day 5 ($p=0.004$) and day 6 ($p=0.000$).

DISCUSSION

Endotracheal intubation is frequently a life-saving treatment used on persons who are comatose or unable to breathe. Endotracheal Intubation keeps the airway patent and helps to prevent suffocation. Once the patient has been intubated, it is crucial to keep the endotracheal tube in position. Even routine nursing care can result in tube slippage when endotracheal tubes are improperly secured, which is a primary contributor in developing airway trauma. Thus, avoiding Endotracheal Tube Movement is of the utmost priority. There is convincing evidence that immobilization of the head is important, other measures that are important are the vigilance of medical staff, adequate sedation of the patient and strong fixation of endotracheal tube. So, there are numerous methods available to secure endotracheal tubes. The traditional methods are those using cloth tape or adhesive tape with several techniques existing for each and commercially made endotracheal tube holding devices for Endotracheal Tube Securement in critical care areas [15–21].

CONCLUSION

The findings revealed that for General Assessment, it was concluded that statistically significant result was found between experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 ($p<0.05$) in GCS on day 2

($p=0.017$), in P/F ratio on day1 ($p=0.004$). But most of the observations were statistically non-significant. Also, statistical non-significant result was found in ETT cuff pressure in all observations from day 1 to day 6 ($p>0.05$). Thus, null hypothesis was accepted. Also, for Endotracheal Tube Securement [ETTS] Outcomes, statistically significant result was found between experimental group₁ and experimental group₂ in number of resecurements in all observations from day 1 to day 6 ($p<0.05$). Hence, Endotracheal Tube Holder can be recommended for Endotracheal Tube securement in clinical practice.

Acknowledgement

None

Conflict of Interest

None

Source of Funding

None

Ethical Approval

Approved

REFERENCES

1. What Is a Ventilator? NHLBI, NIH. 2022. Available from: <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/ventilator>
2. E. Dunleap. Safe and easy ways to secure breathing tubesRN (1987) Aug; 50(8):26–27. ISSN: 0033–7021: Available from <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMID3649900>
3. Evron S, Weisenberg M, Harow E, Khazin V, Szmuk P, Gavish D, Ezri T. Proper insertion depth of endotracheal tubes in adults by topographic landmarks measurements. Journal of clinical anesthesia. 2007 Feb 1;19(1):15-9.
4. What Is an Endotracheal Tube?. Verywell Health. 2023. Available from: <https://www.verywellhealth.com/endotracheal-tube-information-2249093>
5. Krinsley JS, Barone JE. The drive to survive: unplanned extubation in the ICU. Chest. 2005 Aug 1;128(2):560-6.
6. Bouza C, Garcia E, Diaz M, Segovia E, Rodriguez I. Unplanned extubation in orally intubated medical patients in the intensive care unit: a prospective cohort study. Heart & Lung. 2007 Jul 1;36(4):270-6.
7. Jarachovic M, Mason M, Kerber K, McNett M. The role of standardized protocols in unplanned extubations in a medical intensive care unit. American journal of critical care. 2011 Jul 1;20(4):304-12.
8. Chevron V, Menard JF, Richard JC, Girault C, Leroy J, Bonmarchand G. Unplanned extubation: risk factors of development and predictive criteria for reintubation. Critical care medicine. 1998 Jun 1;26(6):1049-53.
9. K.M. Birkett, K.A. Southerland, Reporting slippage, Intensive and Critical Care Nursing. 2005 April; 21 (2): 65–75.doi: 10.1016/j. ejcdt. 2014.09.006 : ISSN: 0964–3397
10. H. Kamalipour, K. Kardan. New method for the fixation of the endotracheal tube in patients with facial and hair. Eastern Mediterranean health journal. 2003 Jan-Mar; 9 (1) :108–12: ISSN: 1020–3397
11. S. Barnson, J. Graham, C. Wild et al. Comparison of two endotracheal tube securement techniques on unplanned extubation, oral mucosa and facial skin integrity. Heart Lung. 1998 Nov-Dec; 27(6):409–17
12. L.C. Mion, A.F. Minnick, R.M. Leipsig, et al. Patient-initiated device removal in ICUs: A National Prevalence Study. Crit. Care Med. 2007 Dec [cited 2022April7];35(12):2714–2720:
13. J. Carlson, J. Mayrose, R. Krause, D. Jehle. Extubation force: tape versus endotracheal tube holders. Annals of Emergency Medicine. 50 (6) 2007 Dec; 50 (6) :686–91

14. Yeh SH, Lee LN, Ho TH, Chiang MC, Lin LW. Implications of nursing care in the occurrence and consequences of unplanned extubation in adult intensive care units. *International journal of nursing studies*. 2004 Mar 1;41(3):255-62.
15. da Silva PS, Fonseca MC. Unplanned endotracheal extubations in the intensive care unit: systematic review, critical appraisal, and evidence-based recommendations. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*. 2012 May 1;114(5):1003-14.
16. Roberts JR, Hedges JR. Roberts and Hedges' clinical procedures in emergency medicine E-book. Elsevier Health Sciences; 2013 May 28.
17. Finucane BT, Santora AH. Principles of Airway Management. *British journal of Anaesthesia*. 3rd ed. New York, NY: Springer; 2003 Dec; 91 (6):927
18. Robert JT. Fundamentals of Tracheal Intubation. New York, NY: Grune and Stratton; 1983 Aug.
19. Boulain T. Unplanned extubations in the adult intensive care unit: A prospective multicenter study. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*. 1998 Apr; 157 (4 Pt 1) :1131-7
20. Wilcox SR, Bittner EA, Elmer J, Seigel TA, Nguyen NT, Dhillon A, et al. Neuromuscular blocking agent administration for emergent tracheal intubation is associated with decreased prevalence of procedure-related complications. *Critical Care Medicine*. 2012 Jun;40(6):1808-13
21. Kapadia FN, Tekawade PC, Nath SS, Pachpute SS, Saverkar SS, Bhise RA, Chavan AC, Varghese SJ, Kantak VU, Kshirsagar RV, Neve VA, D'souza SO. A prolonged observational study of tracheal tube displacements: Benchmarking an incidence <0.5-1% in a medical-surgical adult intensive care unit. *Indian Journal of Critical Care Medicine*. 2014 May;18(5):273-7