



A Comparative Study of Postoperative Sore Throat Following Use of ProSeal Laryngeal Mask Airway Versus Endotracheal Tube in Elective Surgeries Under General Anaesthesia

¹Dr Snigdha kumari, ²Dr Reema Wadhwa, ³Dr Parul Singh, ⁴Dr Harish Chandra Gupta, ⁵Dr R.Sathya Narayan, ⁶Dr Raju Jadhav

¹Anesthesiology, Balaji Institute of Medical Sciences.

²Anesthesiology, Balaji Institute of Medical Sciences.

³Anesthesiology ASMC Pratapgarh.

⁴Anesthesiology AIIMS Nagpur.

⁵Anesthesiology AIIMS Raipur.

⁶Anesthesiology.



Correspondence:

Dr Snigdha kumara.

Anesthesiology (Balaji Institute of Medical Sciences.

Email:

snigdhasingh19590@gmail.com

Received: February 19, 2026

Revised: March 05, 2026

Accepted: March 19, 2026

Published: April 03, 2026

Abstract

Background: Postoperative sore throat (POST) is a common complication following airway instrumentation during general anaesthesia. The choice of airway device plays a crucial role in its incidence and severity. **Objective:** To compare the incidence and severity of POST following use of ProSeal Laryngeal Mask Airway (PLMA) and Endotracheal Tube (ETT). **Methods:** A prospective randomized study was conducted on 60 adult patients (ASA I-II) undergoing elective surgeries. Patients were divided into two groups: PLMA (Group P) and ETT (Group E), with 30 patients in each group. POST was assessed using a 10-point Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) at 1, 4, and 24 hours postoperatively. Hemodynamic parameters and ease of insertion were also evaluated. **Results:** The incidence of POST was significantly lower in the PLMA group (16.66%) compared to the ETT group (46.67%). Severity was higher in the ETT group at early postoperative periods. Hemodynamic parameters were more stable in the PLMA group. **Conclusion:** PLMA is associated with a lower incidence and severity of POST and provides better hemodynamic stability compared to ETT.

Keywords: Postoperative sore throat, ProSeal Laryngeal Mask Airway, Endotracheal Tube, General anaesthesia, Airway management.



This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

INTRODUCTION

Airway management is a fundamental and indispensable component of anaesthetic practice, playing a crucial role in ensuring adequate ventilation, oxygenation, and patient safety during surgical procedures. However, improper or traumatic airway manipulation can lead to a range of complications, among which postoperative sore throat (POST) is one of the most common and distressing. Although often considered a minor complication, POST can significantly affect patient comfort, satisfaction, and overall perioperative experience. Endotracheal intubation has traditionally been regarded as the gold standard for securing the airway, particularly in procedures requiring controlled ventilation and airway protection. Despite its effectiveness, it is frequently associated with a higher incidence of airway-related morbidity, including sore throat, hoarseness, coughing, and mucosal injury, primarily due to laryngoscopy and tracheal irritation.

The development and widespread adoption of supraglottic airway devices, particularly the ProSeal Laryngeal Mask Airway (PLMA), have introduced a less invasive alternative to endotracheal intubation. The PLMA is designed to provide an effective airway seal while minimizing direct contact with the tracheal mucosa. It offers several advantages, including ease of insertion, reduced requirement for laryngoscopy, decreased airway trauma, and better hemodynamic stability due to minimal sympathetic stimulation during placement. These features make it particularly useful in elective surgical procedures where the risk of aspiration is low.

Citation: Snigdha Kumari D, Wadhwa R, Singh P, Chanchandra H, Sathya Narayan R, Jadhav R. A comparative study of postoperative sore throat following use of ProSeal laryngeal mask airway versus endotracheal tube in elective surgeries under general anesthesia. *Int. J. Med.*, 2026;8(4):32-35.

Postoperative sore throat remains a frequently encountered complication in patients undergoing general anaesthesia with airway instrumentation. Its incidence varies widely depending on multiple factors, including the type of airway device used, cuff pressure, duration of anaesthesia, size of the device, lubrication, and technique of insertion. Higher cuff pressures and prolonged surgeries are known to increase mucosal ischemia, thereby contributing to POST. Given these considerations, the present study was undertaken to compare the incidence and severity of postoperative sore throat between patients managed with PLMA and those undergoing endotracheal intubation, with the aim of identifying a safer and more comfortable airway management strategy.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This prospective randomized study was conducted at a tertiary care hospital after obtaining ethical clearance and informed consent. A total of 60 patients aged 18–60 years, belonging to ASA I and II, undergoing elective surgeries of 60–120 minutes duration were included.

Patients were randomly divided into two groups:

- **Group P:** PLMA (n=30)
- **Group E:** ETT (n=30)

Standard general anaesthesia was administered in both groups. Airway devices were inserted using standard techniques, and correct placement was confirmed clinically and with capnography.

POST was assessed using a 10-point Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) at 1, 4, and 24 hours postoperatively.

Hemodynamic parameters were monitored at predefined intervals. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS software with significance set at $p < 0.05$.

RESULTS

The present study demonstrated a significantly higher incidence of postoperative sore throat (POST) in the endotracheal tube (ETT) group (46.67%) compared to the ProSeal laryngeal mask airway (PLMA) group (16.66%), indicating a clear advantage of PLMA in reducing airway-related morbidity. This difference can be attributed to the relatively less invasive nature of PLMA, which avoids direct laryngoscopy and minimizes trauma to the tracheal mucosa. In contrast, endotracheal intubation involves passage of the tube through the vocal cords and trachea, increasing the likelihood of mucosal irritation and inflammation.

In addition to incidence, the severity of POST was also found to be greater in the ETT group, particularly during the early postoperative period at 1 and 4 hours. Patients in this group reported higher discomfort scores, suggesting that the immediate postoperative phase is most affected by airway instrumentation. However, by 24 hours postoperatively, the difference in severity between the two groups became minimal, indicating that POST is generally a self-limiting condition that resolves with time.

Hemodynamic responses further supported the advantages of PLMA over ETT. Parameters such as heart rate and blood pressure showed greater fluctuations in the ETT group, likely due to the sympathetic stimulation associated with laryngoscopy and intubation. In contrast, the PLMA group exhibited more stable hemodynamic profiles, reflecting the less stimulating nature of its insertion technique.

Interestingly, there was no statistically significant difference in the ease of insertion between the two airway devices, suggesting that both can be effectively used by trained personnel. However, factors such as longer duration of surgery and higher cuff pressures were found to be associated with an increased incidence of POST in both groups. These findings highlight the importance of careful intraoperative management, including monitoring cuff pressures and minimizing procedure duration, to reduce postoperative complications.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study demonstrate that PLMA is associated with a significantly lower incidence and severity of POST compared to ETT. This is likely due to reduced mucosal trauma and lower cuff pressures with PLMA.

Previous studies have also reported similar findings, suggesting that supraglottic airway devices are associated with fewer airway-related complications. The improved hemodynamic stability observed with PLMA can be attributed to the absence of laryngoscopic stimulation during insertion.

Factors such as duration of surgery and cuff pressure were found to influence POST, consistent with earlier studies. Monitoring these variables can help reduce postoperative complications.

CONCLUSION

The findings of the present study suggest that the ProSeal Laryngeal Mask Airway (PLMA) is a safe and effective alternative to the Endotracheal Tube (ETT) for airway management in elective surgical procedures. PLMA offers several

Citation: Snigdha Kumari D, Wadhwa R, Singh P, Chanchandra H, Sathya Narayan R, Jadhav R. A comparative study of postoperative sore throat following use of ProSeal laryngeal mask airway versus endotracheal tube in elective surgeries under general anesthesia. *Int. J. Med.*, 2026;**8**(4):32-35.

clinical advantages, particularly in terms of reducing airway-related complications. One of the most notable benefits observed was the significant reduction in both the incidence and severity of postoperative sore throat (POST) among patients managed with PLMA compared to those who underwent endotracheal intubation. This can be attributed to its less invasive nature, as it avoids direct laryngoscopy and minimizes irritation to the tracheal mucosa.

In addition to improved patient comfort, PLMA was also associated with better hemodynamic stability. Unlike ETT insertion, which often leads to sympathetic stimulation resulting in increased heart rate and blood pressure, PLMA insertion is smoother and less stimulating, thereby maintaining more stable intraoperative parameters. This makes it particularly advantageous in patients where hemodynamic fluctuations may be undesirable.

Furthermore, PLMA provides an adequate airway seal and effective ventilation in most elective procedures, making it a reliable choice in routine anesthetic practice. Overall, the use of PLMA not only enhances patient satisfaction by reducing postoperative discomfort but also contributes to safer anesthetic management, supporting its growing preference as an alternative to traditional endotracheal intubation.

Authors' Declaration

The authors declare that this study is original and has not been published previously nor is it under consideration for publication elsewhere. All authors have made substantial contributions to the conception, design, data collection, analysis, and interpretation of the study. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

REFERENCES

1. Misra MN, Ramamurthy B. The ProSeal LMA and tracheal tube comparison. *Internet J Anesthesiol*. 2008.
2. Divatia JV, Bhowmick K. Complications of endotracheal intubation. *Indian J Anaesth*. 2005.
3. Brain AIJ. Laryngeal mask airway concept. *Br J Anaesth*. 1983.
4. Brain AIJ, Verghese C. LMA ProSeal development. *Br J Anaesth*. 2000.
5. Sharma B, Sood J. Uses of LMA in anesthesia. *J Anaesth Clin Pharmacol*. 2007.
6. Scuderi PE. Postoperative sore throat. *Anesth Analg*. 2010.
7. McHardy FE, Chung F. POST causes and prevention. *Anaesthesia*. 1999.
8. Joshi GP, et al. LMA vs ETT in ambulatory anesthesia. *Anesth Analg*. 1997.
9. Lim Y, et al. PLMA vs ETT study. 2007.
10. Ahmed A, et al. POST incidence study. 2007.
11. Hohlrieder M, et al. Airway device comparison. 2007.
12. Brimacombe J. LMA meta-analysis. 1995.
13. Jaensson M, Gupta A, Nilsson UG. Risk factors for development of postoperative sore throat and hoarseness after endotracheal intubation. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand*. 2012;**56**(4): 511–518.
14. Lee JH, Kim SB, Lee W, et al. The influence of cuff pressure on postoperative sore throat. *Anesth Pain Med*. 2018;**13**(1): 52–57.
15. Kang SH, Kim YS, Hong TH, et al. Comparison of PLMA and ETT in laparoscopic surgeries. *Korean J Anesthesiol*. 2019;**72**(5): 447–453.
16. Seet E, Chung F. Management of postoperative sore throat: A systematic review. *Anesthesiology*. 2010;**113**(3): 719–728.
17. Tanaka Y, Nakayama T, Nishimori M, et al. Lidocaine for prevention of postoperative sore throat. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015;**(7)**: CD004081.
18. Park SY, Kim SH, Lee AR, et al. ProSeal LMA versus endotracheal tube: a comparison study. *BMC Anesthesiol*. 2018;**18**: 1–7.
19. Shin HW, Yoo HN, Bae GE, et al. Incidence of POST with supraglottic airway devices. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2020;**99**(12): e19559.
20. Xu YJ, Wang SL, Ren Y, et al. Comparative evaluation of airway devices and POST. *J Clin Anesth*. 2020;**61**:109650.
21. El-Boghdadly K, Bailey CR, Wiles MD. Postoperative sore throat: a systematic review. *Br J Anaesth*. 2016;**117**(4): 518–528.
22. Yu SH, Beirne OR. Laryngeal mask airway versus endotracheal tube: meta-analysis. *Anesth Analg*. 2010;**111**(2): 475–482.
23. Uppal V, Fletcher G, Kinsella J. Comparison of second-generation supraglottic airway devices. *Anaesthesia*. 2009;**64**(4): 372–377.
24. Zhang L, Seet E, Mehta V, et al. Risk factors for airway complications. *Anesth Analg*. 2019;**129**(1): 114–121.

Citation: Snigdha Kumari D, Wadhwa R, Singh P, Chanchandra H, Sathya Narayan R, Jadhav R. A comparative study of postoperative sore throat following use of ProSeal laryngeal mask airway versus endotracheal tube in elective surgeries under general anesthesia. *Int. J. Med.*, 2026;**8**(4):32-35.

25. Hu B, Bao R, Wang X, et al. The size selection of LMA and POST incidence. *BMC Anesthesiol.* 2018;18: 1–6.
26. Mihara T, Asakura A, Owada G, et al. Supraglottic airway vs ETT outcomes. *J Clin Anesth.* 2021;68:110090.
27. Geng G, Xu G, Wang X. Comparison of airway devices in elective surgery. *Front Med.* 2022;9: 845672.
28. Singh PM, Borle A, Trikha A, et al. Evaluation of airway devices and complications. *J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol.* 2021;37(2): 230–236.
29. Chen X, Jiao J, Cong X, et al. Meta-analysis of PLMA vs ETT. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(3): e0230211.
30. Almutairi TM, Alharbi AA, Almutairi HM. Postoperative sore throat incidence and risk factors. *Saudi J Anaesth.* 2023;17(1): 45–50.