

A randomised crossover comparison of the Cobra Perilaryngeal Airway (CobraPLA®) and Classic Laryngeal Mask Airway™ during anaesthesia in ventilated patients

Submission date 30/09/2005	Recruitment status Stopped	<input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input type="checkbox"/> Protocol
Registration date 30/09/2005	Overall study status Stopped	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results
Last Edited 06/03/2009	Condition category Surgery	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data <input type="checkbox"/> Record updated in last year

Plain English summary of protocol

Not provided at time of registration

Contact information

Type(s)

Scientific

Contact name

Dr Tim Cook

Contact details

Anaesthesia
Royal United Hospital
Bath & North East Somerset Council
Bath
United Kingdom
BA1 3NG

Additional identifiers

EudraCT/CTIS number

IRAS number

ClinicalTrials.gov number

Secondary identifying numbers

N0212140555

Study information

Scientific Title

Study objectives

Does the CobraPLA® perform as well as the Classic Laryngeal Mask Airway™ during anaesthesia?

Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

Ethics approval(s)

Not provided at time of registration

Study design

Randomised controlled trial

Primary study design

Interventional

Secondary study design

Randomised controlled trial

Study setting(s)

Hospital

Study type(s)

Treatment

Participant information sheet

Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Surgery: Anaesthesia

Interventions

CobraPLA® and Classic Laryngeal Mask Airway™

Intervention Type

Procedure/Surgery

Phase

Not Applicable

Primary outcome measure

Not provided at time of registration

Secondary outcome measures

Not provided at time of registration

Overall study start date

01/05/2004

Completion date

13/08/2004

Reason abandoned (if study stopped)

Terminated due to two cases of pulmonary aspiration during this and a related study which lead to the decision that the risk to the participants of continuing the study outweighed the potential benefits.

Eligibility

Key inclusion criteria

1. Patients undergoing anaesthesia with ventilation of the lungs
2. Patients have been included if they were undergoing elective anaesthesia for surgery

Participant type(s)

Patient

Age group

Not Specified

Sex

Not Specified

Target number of participants

8 patients recruited - aiming for 32

Key exclusion criteria

Not provided at time of registration

Date of first enrolment

01/05/2004

Date of final enrolment

13/08/2004

Locations

Countries of recruitment

England

United Kingdom

Study participating centre

Anaesthesia
Bath
United Kingdom
BA1 3NG

Sponsor information

Organisation
Department of Health

Sponsor details
Richmond House
79 Whitehall
London
United Kingdom
SW1A 2NL
+44 (0)20 7307 2622
dhmail@doh.gsi.org.uk

Sponsor type
Government

Website
<http://www.dh.gov.uk/Home/fs/en>

Funder(s)

Funder type
Government

Funder Name
Royal United Hospital Bath NHS Trust (UK)

Results and Publications

Publication and dissemination plan
Not provided at time of registration

Intention to publish date

Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

IPD sharing plan summary
Not provided at time of registration

Study outputs

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
Results article	results	01/08/2005		Yes	No