



Guidelines

Expert consensus-based clinical practice guidelines for Care and weaning procedures in tracheostomized ICU patients after invasive mechanical ventilation: a joint statement by the Intensive Care Physiotherapy Society (SKR) and the French Intensive Care Society (SRLF)

Clément Medrinal^{a,1,*}, Julie Delemazure^{b,1}, Manon Billard^c, Dorothée Carpentier^d,
Gérald Choukroun^e, Yann Combret^f, Anne-Claire De Crouy^g, Carlos Díaz López^h,
Jonathan Dugernierⁱ, Muriel Farcy^j, Adela Foudhaili^k, Thomas Gallice^l, Peggy Gatignol^m,
Zina Ghelabⁿ, Marie-Hélène Houze^o, Mélissa Jezequel^p, Anne-Claire Latiers^q, Mehdi Marzouk^r,
Elise Morawiec^s, Lise Piquilloud^t, Aude Ruttimann^u, Perrine Sanchez^v, Nicolas Terzi^w, Arnaud
W. Thille^x, Matthieu Reffienna^y

^a Univ Rouen Normandie, GRHVN UR 3830, Intensive Care Unit Department Le Havre Hospital, 76290 Montivilliers, Rouen University Hospital, Department of Pulmonary Rehabilitation, Rouen F76000, France

^b AP-HP, Groupe Hospitalier Universitaire APHP-Sorbonne Université, Site Pitié-Salpêtrière, Service de Médecine Intensive et Réanimation (Département R3S), F-75013 Paris, France

^c Service Médecine Intensive-Réanimation, Centre Hospitalier Albi, 81000 Albi, France

^d Medical Intensive Care Unit, Rouen University Hospital, Rouen F76000, France

^e Post-ICU Respiratory Weaning Unit, Forcilles Hospital, Ferolles-Attilly, France

^f Physiotherapy Department, Le Havre Hospital, 76600, Le Havre, Erphan UR 20201, Paris-Saclay University, 78000, Versailles, France

^g Département d'Anesthésie Réanimation, Service de Rééducation Post-Réanimation (SRPR), Hôpital Universitaire de Bicêtre, APHP, Université Paris-Saclay, Le Kremlin-Bicêtre, France

^h Physiotherapy Department, Forcilles Hospital, F-77150, Ferolles-Attilly, France

ⁱ Haute Ecole Arc Santé, HES-SO University of Applied Sciences and Arts Western, Delémont. Neuchâtel Hospital, Réseau Hospitalier Neuchâtelois, Neuchâtel, Switzerland

^j AP-HP, Hôpital Raymond Poincaré et Hôpital Sainte Perine, Pharmacie, Unité Dispositifs Médicaux Stériles, 92380 Garches, France

^k Université Paris Cité, Inserm U942 MASCOT, AP-HP, Département de Médecine Physique et Réadaptation, CHU Lariboisière, Paris, France

^l CHU de Bordeaux, Hôpital Pellegrin, Réanimation Neurologique, Neurochirurgie B, HDJ Déglutition, Equipe ACTIVE, BPH, INSERM U1219, Université de Bordeaux, France

^m AP-HP, ENT Department, Pitié-Salpêtrière University Hospital, INSERM, UMRS1158 Neurophysiologie Respiratoire Expérimentale et Clinique, Sorbonne Université, Paris, France

ⁿ AP-HP and University of Paris, Division of Paediatric Otolaryngology, Robert Debré Hospital, Paris, France

^o AP-HP, CHU Lariboisière, Département de Médecine Physique et Réadaptation, F-75010 Paris, France

^p Unité de Soins Intensifs de Cardiologie, Centre Hospitalier de Saint-Brieuc, Saint-Brieuc, France

^q Service de Kinésithérapie et Ergothérapie, Cliniques Universitaires Saint-Luc, IRIIL, Institut de Recherche Expérimentale et Clinique (IREC), Pôle de Pneumologie, O.R.L. et Dermatologie (LuNS, Lung-Nose-Skin), Université Catholique de Louvain (UCLouvain), Brussels, Belgium

^r Médecine Intensive Réanimation, Centre Hospitalier D'Arras, Arras, France

^s Department of Pneumology, Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital, 75013 Paris, France

^t Adult Intensive Care Unit, University Hospital of Lausanne and Lausanne University, Lausanne, Switzerland

^u Service de Médecine Intensive-Réanimation, Hôpital Cochin, Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Paris, Paris, France

^v Cabinet du Stiletto, Private Practice, Ajaccio, France

^w Department of Medical Intensive Care, CHU Grenoble-Alpes, Grenoble, France

^x CHU de Poitiers, Médecine Intensive Réanimation, Poitiers, France

^y Hôpital Foch, Service de Réanimation Polyvalente, Suresnes, Université Paris Cité, Inserm, U1149 CRI, France Université Paris Cité, URP3625, Paris, France

Introduction

Extubation failure after invasive mechanical ventilation occurs frequently. Several large-scale cohort studies have reported rates of

failure between 14% and 18%, and 35% of patients had not been weaned at three months [1–3]. To facilitate weaning, tracheostomy is a procedure commonly used in ICU patients whose liberation from mechanical ventilation is unsuccessful. French expert guidance considers tracheostomy in adult ICUs as a procedure planned mainly as anticipation for prolonged weaning or after failed extubation; the panel suggests considering tracheostomy as an option when weaning extends > 7 days after the first spontaneous breathing trial failure, and in acquired reversible neuromuscular disorders [4]. In 2018, French national insurance data on 77,132 critically ill patients indicated that 3,688 (4.8%) had undergone tracheostomy [5]. Tracheostomy rates

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: clement.medrinal1@univ-rouen.fr (C. Medrinal).

¹ The authors contributed equally.

reported in large cohorts ranged from 21% for all patients with separation attempts to 63% for patients in prolonged weaning [3].

Tracheostomy presents many advantages. Its purposes are well-known to clinicians: the ability to maintain mechanical ventilation and secure airway access, reduced work of breathing via decreased upper-airway resistance, improved patient comfort, decreased sedative exposure, liberation of the mouth to restore phonation and swallowing and promote mobilization. Nevertheless, these advantages should be weighed against uncommon but at times severe complications. Across contemporary cohorts, post-tracheostomy ventilator weaning typically takes about 12 days (IQR 7–20) in COVID-19 series, with 21% mortality and 93% of survivors weaned and 86% decannulated [6]. In a general ICU cohort tracheostomized for complex weaning, hospital mortality was 24%, 37.5% had a poor outcome (death or discharge with tracheostomy), 62.5% were alive and decannulated at hospital discharge, and the median time from intubation to decannulation was 42 days [7].

The management of tracheostomized patients is specific and requires adequate knowledge of the available devices, upper-airway physiology, and the mechanisms of phonation and swallowing. Many steps of weaning and bedside care remain insufficiently described, markedly heterogeneous, and largely practice-based. In light of these considerations, updated, standardized guidelines for post-tracheostomy ventilator weaning and decannulation in ICU patients are needed.

We are presenting updated, evidence-aligned guidelines for adult ICU tracheostomy care, from ventilator weaning through restoration of phonation and swallowing to decannulation. The guidelines are designed for the multidisciplinary teams managing tracheostomy across the ICU-to-ward continuum (intensivists, ICU physiotherapists, respiratory therapists, nurses, speech-language pathologists, otolaryngologists, thoracic surgeons, and rehabilitation professionals). They should also inform researchers and hospital leaders responsible for pathway design and policy, and serve as a teaching resource for trainees as well as for patients and families.

Method

We defined the target population as adult patients with a tracheostomy performed during or following an ICU stay for prolonged or complex weaning, irrespective of timing ($<$ or $\geq$ day 7) or technique (percutaneous or surgical). This definition was used both to guide our literature search (eligibility criteria) and to specify the population to whom our recommendations apply. Acquired, potentially reversible neurologic disorders were included (e.g., Guillain-Barré syndrome, brain or spinal injury and critical illness weakness).

The following were excluded: patients with burns; those tracheostomized for oncologic, otorhinolaryngology surgery, or traumatic upper-airway lesions; patients with progressive neuromuscular diseases (e.g., amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, myotonic disorders); and all paediatric patients.

The guidelines were developed by 25 experts in adult ICU care affiliated with the Intensive Care Physiotherapy Society (Société de Kinésithérapie de Réanimation, SKR) and the French Intensive Care Society (Société de Réanimation de Langue Française, SRLF). The experts used the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) methodology [8]. The steering committee (CM, JD, AWT and MR) identified key questions for the adult population in PICO format; these were validated by the expert task force and defined the scope of the literature search. For each question, the task force specified indexing terms, time limits, the target population, and prespecified outcomes. According to the GRADE, each retrieved study was assigned a level of evidence based on design and methodological quality. The panel then determined the overall level of evidence for each PICO question, considering the

certainty across studies, consistency of results, and the balance of benefits and harms. A high overall level of evidence led to a strong recommendation (GRADE 1) (“should be done” or “should not be done”); a moderate or low level of evidence led to an optional recommendation (GRADE 2) (“should probably be done” or “should probably not be done”). In the absence of sufficient evidence, statements were issued as expert opinion; when evidence was contradictory or absent, the panel stated that no recommendation could be made.

Recommendations were discussed during five meetings of the full panel. Experts then rated each recommendation individually on a 1–9 scale (1–3, disagreement; 4–6, indecision; 7–9, agreement). A recommendation was considered approved if at least 50% agreed and no more than 20% disagreed. Strong agreement was defined as agreement by at least 70% of the experts. When strong agreement was not achieved, the recommendation was revised and re-rated. Only expert opinion statements having obtained strong agreement were adopted.

Results are presented as the formulated recommendation, followed by the strength of the recommendation, and the rationale that led to it. Where possible, a carbon footprint analysis was performed.

Results

Across 24 PICO questions, the panel issued the following 25 assessments: no strong recommendation (GRADE 1), seven conditional recommendations (GRADE 2), ten expert opinion statements, and eight “no recommendations”.

R1: For tracheostomized (>72 h) adults patients undergoing ventilator weaning for respiratory or neurologic reasons, experts suggest performing daily stoma care without antiseptics.

Expert opinion, strong agreement

To date, no study has compared povidone iodine versus no antiseptics for tracheostomy care on clinical outcomes (local infection, ventilator-associated pneumonia, skin lesions or comfort). A single randomized controlled trial [9] involving 100 patients compared polyhexanide versus saline + Povidone iodine for tracheostomy care, assessing the occurrence of local infections. No significant difference in local infection rates was observed between care with polyhexanide and care with Povidone iodine. In 2017, the CDC guideline recommended not to apply antimicrobial agents (ointments, solutions, or powders) to surgical incisions, the objective being to prevent surgical site infection [10]. These recommendations are consistent with those of the Haute Autorité de Santé, which specify that cleansing with mild soap or normal saline is sufficient to limit the risk of infection [11].

According to the Carebon app tool, the carbon footprint shows that use of antiseptics such as Betadine or chlorhexidine has a higher impact (e.g., 0.69 kgCO₂e for 500 mL of Betadine vs 1.78 kgCO₂e for 125 mL of chlorhexidine), whereas liquid soap or normal saline have a lower impact (about 0.47–1.29 kgCO₂e per kilogram).

Accordingly, experts suggest not using antiseptics for standard daily stoma care, preferring mild soap, normal saline, or water.

R2: The experts suggest using foam dressings to limit the risk of pressure injury.

Expert opinion, strong agreement

Hydrophilic polyurethane foam dressings are non-adhesive pads placed around the tracheostoma or beneath tracheostomy ties. They are designed to absorb secretions and maintain a moist peristomal environment; their typical thickness (~ 0.5 mm) provides cushioning under the flange or ties and may help limit local pressure and friction

[12]. They are analogous in composition and use to non-adhesive hydrocellular dressings for chronic wounds (e.g., leg ulcers). Evidence specific to tracheostomy care remains limited. To our knowledge, no studies published after the 2018 recommendations have provided additional data on the risk of local infection. Several studies on tracheostomy-related pressure injuries suggest lower incidence with foam-based dressings and associated preventive measures. In a meta-analysis, Moser et al. reported overall incidence of tracheostomy-related pressure injury of 17.0% in control groups versus 3.5% in intervention groups (an overall 79% relative reduction (95% CI, 63–96%) [13]. Because interventions in the active arms varied across studies, and since foam dressings were the common element among effective strategies, these findings cannot be attributed with certainty to a single component. Experts suggest applying a foam dressing around the stoma, ensuring it is not occlusive.

R3: Given the lack of data, no recommendation can be made regarding the type of oral care to be performed.

No recommendation. Strong agreement

Oral care is routine in ICUs, with most of the evidence involving intubated patients; however, relevant findings are heterogeneous [4]. In a 2023 meta-analysis of four trials, povidone-iodine did not significantly reduce ventilator-associated pneumonia versus either placebo/standard oral care (pooled RR 0.61, 95% CI 0.25–1.47) or versus chlorhexidine (RR 1.50, 95% CI 0.46–4.87) [14]. In 2024, international guidelines from the Infectious Diseases Society recommended oropharyngeal care with tooth-brushing without chlorhexidine for patients ventilated in ICU via either an endotracheal tube or tracheostomy [15], due to potential adverse effects reported in some studies (increased mortality and infections) (16), of which the mechanisms remain to be clarified. In tracheostomized patients, one step-down (post-ICU) study compared ventilator-associated pneumonia rates under a standardized oral-care protocol (tooth-brushing + 0.12% chlorhexidine every 12 h) with NHSN benchmark data for tracheostomy and endotracheal-tube cohorts [17]. No significant difference in ventilator-associated pneumonia incidence was found. However, the study had major limitations: non-comparability of groups (tracheostomized patients in the intervention vs a mixed intubated/tracheostomized population in the control) and a lack of information on the type and frequency of oropharyngeal care in the control group. Current ICU oral-care guidance supports tooth-brushing without routine antiseptics, given a lack of proven benefit and potential harms.

R4: Experts suggest not suturing tracheostomy cannulas outside of specific situations.

Expert opinion, strong agreement

Fixation of the tracheostomy tube with neck ties alone or with additional skin sutures placed through the outer flange are two common techniques intended to secure the cannula and mitigate peristomal complications; skin sutures are used more often after surgical than following percutaneous tracheostomy. While accidental decannulation (unexpected tube removal from the stoma by the patient or during care) occurs infrequently in both early and late postoperative periods, it entails significant morbidity and mortality when it happens early after tube placement. In a multi-institutional retrospective analysis of 1,175 tracheostomies across eight academic centres, decannulation rates were <1% in both skin-sutured and non-sutured groups, with no significant difference between techniques [18]. A 2021 single-region retrospective study of 1,355 predominantly medical and trauma patients compared events within the first seven days after cannula placement and likewise found no statistically significant difference in accidental decannulation between Velcro neck ties and skin-sutured fixation (1.54% vs 1.11%); skin-suture

fixation showed a numerically higher ulceration rate that was not statistically significant [19]. In addition to fixation technique, a prospective pre-post quality-improvement program focusing on staff education, risk identification, and equipment availability led to numerically reduced accidental decannulation (from 4.2 ± 0.9 to 2.7 ± 1.9 per 1,000 tracheostomy-days; $p = 0.04$) [20]. In conclusion, serious adverse events such as accidental decannulation are rare and not directly related to the fixation technique applied. Current observational data do not show lower dislodgement rates with skin-suture fixation compared with neck ties alone. Skin sutures should consequently be reserved for selected high-risk situations.

R5.1: For tracheostomized adults with an air-inflated cuff, experts suggest maintaining cuff pressure lower than 30 cmH₂O to decrease the risk of tracheal injury.

Expert opinion, strong agreement

R5.2: For tracheostomized adults with an air-inflated cuff, experts suggest maintaining cuff pressure greater than 20 cmH₂O in order to limit the occurrence of ventilator-acquired pneumonia.

Expert opinion, strong agreement

Evidence specific to tracheostomized adults on target cuff pressure is limited and imprecise, much of the rationale relies on studies in intubated patients, many of whom are elderly. Physiologically, elevated cuff pressures (>30 cmH₂O) reduce tracheal mucosal capillary blood flow at the cuff-mucosa interface, predisposing to ischemia and subsequent scar-related injury leading to tracheal stenosis [21,22]. In this context, high-volume, low-pressure cuff designs were adopted to distribute surface pressure and mitigate mucosal injury, with clinical data (postoperative/anaesthesia settings) suggesting fewer cuff-related symptoms when pressures are controlled and high-volume, low-pressure cuffs are used [23,24].

Conversely, insufficient cuff pressure increases the risk of micro-aspiration of oropharyngeal secretions and gastric contents. In intubated patients, indirect evidence supports a threshold of ≥ 20 cmH₂O to reduce micro-aspiration and potentially lower ventilator-associated pneumonia risk [25–27]; systems for continuous cuff-pressure control have been associated with decreased micro-aspiration and/or ventilator-associated pneumonia in observational or interventional studies, albeit with moderate-to-low certainty [26,27].

Overall, this extrapolated literature aligns with manufacturer guidance recommending a 20–30 cmH₂O range: below 20 increases aspiration risk, above 30 increases mucosal injury risk.

R6: Given the lack of data on clinical outcome, no recommendation can be made regarding the use of tracheostomy cannulas with or without an inner cannula.

No recommendation. Strong agreement

Practices for the use and replacement of inner cannulas vary widely and rely more on clinical experience than on robust comparative data. In a pilot ICU study, Burns did not show that frequent inner-cannula changes reduced obstruction or colonization, thereby suggesting that the routine may be superfluous, albeit with the caveat that systematic suctioning was performed in the study cohort [28]. Microbiologically, observational series have documented near-constant biofilm on tracheostomy tubes in both inpatient and ambulatory settings; moreover, a largely outpatient study reported an inverse correlation between the frequency of inner-cannula changes and colonization events, a signal insufficient to establish causality [29]. Experimental data consistently show that inserting an inner cannula reduces lumen section diameter and increases resistive load: on bench testing, placement of the inner cannula increased

inspiratory/expiratory resistance by roughly two- to threefold, while removal significantly decreased imposed ventilatory work [30–32]. Other tests have confirmed that tube and inner-cannula type (model, size) alter pressure–flow curves and inspiratory/expiratory resistance, with substantial variability across devices [30,32]. Secretions within the inner cannula represent a major risk for obstruction [33]; however, removal of the inner cannula can relieve obstruction when suction alone is insufficient [30]; this can be considered as an advantage. In conclusion, the available evidence does not support recommending for or against systematic inner-cannula use; decisions should remain individualized according to secretion burden, monitoring capacity, and weaning dynamics [28–30].

R7: Normal saline instillation should probably not be performed routinely during tracheal suctioning.

Grade 2–. Strong agreement

Normal saline instillation before endotracheal suctioning remains common, due to a strong perceived benefit among nurses despite limited supporting evidence [34,35]. Current literature, however, questions the effectiveness and safety of routine use. A 2017 meta-analysis pooling five RCTs ($n = 337$) reported higher volumes recorded as “secretions” after instillation; since the recovered volume includes the instilled saline, this endpoint does not demonstrate increased mucus yield [36]. In another systematic review, only one out of two studies showed an increase; moreover, not all saline is retrieved by suctioning, with gravity-dependent pooling of residual fluid often described in the posterior right lower lobe [35]. Regarding airway obstruction, comparative data are sparse: a randomized trial from 2009 ($n = 262$) found no difference in endotracheal tube occlusion between instillation and control [37]. The frequently cited notion that instillation “stimulates cough” remains anecdotal in this context [35,37]. Desaturation typically follows instillation, with larger volumes producing greater declines and slower return to baseline; in tracheostomized patients with pneumonia ($n = 16$), testing 0, 2, and 5 mL boluses produced dose-related desaturation, with recovery exceeding five minutes after 5 mL [38]. At the meta-analytic level, SpO_2 at five minutes was lower with instillation (pooled mean difference: -1.14%) [36], and more recent synthesis likewise concludes that harms tend to outweigh benefits [39]. The effects on pneumonia remain unsettled. The same 2009 RCT reported less microbiologically proven VAP with instillation (23.5% vs 10.8%) ($p = 0.008$), yet earlier mechanistic work cautions that saline plus suction may displace bacteria into the lower airways [34,37]. Given the real-world prevalence of the practice (88% of ICU nurses report using it) and the balance of current data (desaturation without clear airway-clearance benefit and conflicting infection signals) routine saline instillation should be avoided in tracheostomized adults; if nevertheless considered, it should be selective and justified by patient-specific factors.

R8: Mechanical ventilation weaning should probably use off-ventilator breathing sessions rather than by progressively reducing ventilatory assistance.

Grade 2+. Strong agreement

Weaning by staged spontaneous-breathing sessions disconnected from the ventilator is supported by a randomized trial in 316 adults undergoing prolonged weaning who were transferred to a long-term acute care hospital [40]. In this one study on the topic, consecutive tracheostomized patients ventilated for at least 21 days were screened; exclusion criteria included cardiopulmonary instability, profound neurologic deficits, bilateral phrenic-nerve injury, prior admission, and limited life expectancy. Out of 500 screened patients, 160 (32%) immediately tolerated 120 h (5 days) of unassisted tracheostomy-collar breathing without respiratory distress and were

consequently not randomized (roughly one out of three transferred patients remained on mechanical ventilation despite being immediately ready to wean). This highlights the value of a structured screening process to verify spontaneous breathing ability and to attempt prompt ventilator disconnection. This also suggests that weaning potential may be under-recognized in daily practice.

Patients who developed respiratory distress during the 5-day screening window were randomized to subsequent staged tracheostomy-collar disconnections or to progressive pressure-support (PS) reduction. For randomization, eligible subjects were stratified by time to failure (early failure, 0–12 h; late failure, 12–120 h). In the tracheostomy-collar arm, disconnections followed a strict schedule: up to 12 h on days 1–2 with overnight reconnection, up to 24 h per day from day 3 onward. In the PS arm, tolerance to lower support was assessed three times daily; PS was initially set to target a respiratory rate <30 breaths/min, then decreased in 2 cmH_2O steps up to three times per day. When PS was reduced to 6 cmH_2O with sustained tolerance, patients proceeded to disconnection.

In the randomized cohort, staged disconnections shortened weaning time (15 [8–25] vs 19 [12–31] days; $p = 0.004$) without differences in 6- or 12-month mortality. Of note, staged spontaneous-breathing sessions off the ventilator outperformed pressure support in the subgroup that failed between 12 and 120 h, but not among those who failed within 0–12 h. Taken together, and given the operational simplicity of staged disconnections, progressive off-ventilator sessions appear to be a reasonable default approach for tracheostomized adults in the later phase of prolonged/complex weaning, at least for those able to tolerate more than 12 h of spontaneous breathing after the first disconnection attempt. This strategy naturally coheres with our other recommendations (see R9 and R10 on cuff deflation and speaking-valve use during tolerated sessions).

R9: Periods of ventilator liberation should probably be performed with the cuff deflated.

Grade 2+. Strong agreement

One randomized controlled trial evaluated whether increasing the effective airway diameter, by deflating the cuff and using a fenestrated tracheostomy cannula with a 7-mm inner diameter during ventilator disconnections affected outcomes in 181 tracheostomized adults (deflated, $n = 94$; inflated, $n = 87$). In the control group, an 8-mm inner-diameter cannula with an inner sleeve was used with the cuff inflated [41]. Patients with severe brain injury (Glasgow score $<6/15$) and with severe swallowing disorders evaluated with a 50 ml water drink test with cuff deflated were excluded. Crucially, all patients first passed a tube-occlusion test: with the cuff deflated, the tracheostomy was briefly occluded so that airflow traversed the upper airways to confirm supraglottic patency. During disconnections, both groups received heated, humidified high-flow oxygen via the tracheostomy; the deflated group received higher flow (69 vs. 55 L/min). As regards keeping the cuff inflated, deflation was associated with earlier ventilator liberation (median 3 [2–4] vs 8 [6–10] days to successful 24-h disconnection) and fewer respiratory infections (ventilator-associated pneumonia or tracheobronchitis 20% vs 36%) [41]. Mechanistically, deflation increases the effective airway diameter and may support swallowing by restoring subglottic pressure and upper-airway airflow. Swallowing studies are broadly consistent with this signal: in a crossover series ($n = 12$), feeding with an inflated cuff predicted aspiration, with a non-significant three-fold reduction once the cuff was deflated (7% vs 18%) [42]; physiological work shows shorter swallow-reflex latency, greater laryngeal elevation, and increased anterior hyoid motion when the cuff is deflated [43–45]. A retrospective comparison of video-fluoroscopic swallow exams reported less silent aspiration with the 281 patients with deflated cuff (7%) vs 23% for the 342 patients with inflated cuff [46]. In a randomized video-fluoroscopic crossover study on swallow

physiology ($n = 18$), cuff deflation alone did not change penetration/aspiration across bolus consistencies, but the penetration–aspiration score for liquids was halved when a one-way valve was added to a deflated cuffed tube, consistent with the benefits from routing airflow through the upper airway [45]. Pragmatically, cuff deflation accelerates weaning from ventilator and protects from respiratory infection; moreover, it permits canula occlusion (one-way valve or capping); the step that actively redirects airflow through the upper airway is detailed separately in Recommendation 10.

R10: The experts suggest using a speaking valve, with the cuff deflated, during periods of ventilator liberation.

Expert opinion, strong agreement

This expert opinion is based on 11 studies ($n = 149$). Several provide indirect evidence (neuromuscular or spinal cord–injury populations, mixed cohorts of ventilated and non-ventilated patients, or bench studies) (47–52). Only one randomized controlled crossover single blinded study was identified ($n = 18$) [52]. No trial has evaluated mortality, decannulation, or ICU/hospital length of stay.

A speaking valve can only be used with the cuff deflated. With the valve in place, air may be inspired through the valve and canula, as well as through the upper airways around the canula. During expiration, the flap closes and flow is redirected to the upper airways, enabling phonation.

Use of a speaking valve may improve swallowing, particularly by reducing the number and severity of aspiration events [45,53–55]. This effect could be explained by the restoration of expiratory flow toward the upper airways after swallowing [48]. The valve does not appear to affect ventilatory–swallowing coordination, the number of swallows per minute, or the ability to take oral nutrition [48,50,51]. Other data suggest potential benefits for mobility, olfaction, and pulmonary recruitment [52,55,56]. Importantly, the valve does not significantly increase the work of breathing (no accessory-muscle recruitment and/or increase in measured work of breathing) and effectively redistributes inspiratory flow toward the upper airways [47,49,50]. No adverse events were reported, nor were meaningful changes observed in respiratory rate, heart rate, PaCO_2 , or SpO_2 at the time of valve placement. Finally, because part of inspiratory airflow shunts the upper airways when the speaking valve is used during a long period, particularly when supplemental oxygen is delivered via the tracheostomy, it may predispose to drying [49]; clinicians should monitor mucosal dryness and secretion viscosity and adjust humidification accordingly during extended sessions.

R11: The experts suggest that tracheostomy cannula changes should not be performed systematically.

Expert opinion, strong agreement

Many tracheostomy tubes are certified with short-term intended use (≤ 30 days). As a result, manufacturers' IFUs (instructions for use) commonly limit continuous use to approximately 28–30 days [57]. The 2012 UK consensus conference suggest that the timing window for the first tube change is between day 10 and day 14 after percutaneous dilatational tracheostomy [58]. In ICU practice, French recommendations emphasize individualizing to the patient and point out that early changes carry risks (dislodgement, respiratory arrest) (4). Observational data on the optimal timing of the first tube change after surgical or percutaneous tracheostomy indicate that performing the first change before day 7 shortens both ICU and hospital length of stay without increasing complications [59]. This initial change often involves downsizing. A Korean retrospective study trying to determine the optimal timing of the first change allocated approximately 4,000 patients into three groups (≤ 6 days; 7–9 days; ≥ 10 days); in that study, all-cause mortality was lowest in the 7–9 day group, and the risk of pulmonary complications increased when the tube was

changed within the first six days [60]. Other limited retrospective data suggest that instituting a 15-day routine tube-change procedure may reduce the incidence of granulomas [61].

In the absence of evidence supporting calendar-based replacement, and consistent with our prior recommendation, we do not recommend routine tracheostomy tube changes.

R12: A tracheostomy tube change should probably be integrated into the weaning strategy and considered when the aim is to increase effective airway space (e.g., by downsizing or switching tube type).

Grade 2+. Strong agreement

After confirming upper-airway patency with the tube-occlusion test, a trajectory consisting of off-ventilator sessions (R8), cuff deflation (R9) and speaking-valve use (R10) often allows progress without any additional intervention on the tube. In a long-term acute care hospital (LTACH) for difficult weaning, approximately 32% of patients were liberated with no intervention other than transfer to the LTACH [40]. However in a manometry-guided cohort, speaking-valve use was feasible in 78% with the initial tube, increasing to 95% after individualized optimization [62]. When occlusion or speaking-valve use remains poorly tolerated, whether clinically or on tracheal manometry, targeted tube optimization to increase effective airway space around the tube becomes appropriate, most often through downsizing, as described in Hernández et al. [41]. Clinically, after individualized adjustment, pressures fall, and tolerance of speaking-valve or capping widens, and decannulation is facilitated [62]. Observational data also associate downsizing with successful decannulation (adjusted OR = 6.5) [63]. Taken together, these findings support adoption of a needs-based rather than a routine optimization strategy. It would consist primarily in downsizing and, where appropriate, a type change that reduces intraluminal burden, when the R8–R9–R10 steps are poorly tolerated, consistent with R11 (no systematic routine tube changes).

R13: No recommendation can be made regarding a high-flow therapy device during periods of ventilator liberation.

No recommendation. Strong agreement

In tracheostomized adults disconnected from the ventilator, the evidence base for high-flow therapy delivered through the tracheostomy (HFT) is short, physiologic, and discordant. A randomized crossover comparison reported a small, rapid rise in oxygenation with HFT, with higher $\text{SpO}_2/\text{FiO}_2$ at 5 and 15 min than with a T-piece, without meaningful differences in airway pressure, end-tidal CO_2 , or respiratory rate, suggesting only a modest immediate oxygenation benefit [64]. By contrast, two physiologic crossover studies found no measurable advantage of HFT over T-piece on load and drive [65,66]. Using electrical activity of the diaphragm, neuro-ventilatory drive, Pressure Time Product muscle, respiratory rate, PaCO_2 , and gas exchange were unchanged across HFT and T-piece periods after disconnection, and oxygen targets were achieved at similar FiO_2 , making a relevant positive-pressure effect unlikely [65]. In a separate randomized crossover study, inspiratory effort measurement determined by simplified oesophageal pressure–time product and breathing frequency increased when patients moved from PSV to unassisted breathing, but did not differ between HFT and T-piece; in contrast, oxygenation was higher with T-piece compared to HFT ($p = 0.02$) [66]. Taken together, these physiologic data indicate no consistent reduction in work of breathing or CO_2 with HFT when compared with a T-piece during deventilation. These results were consistent with a bench study that evaluated the work of breathing across tracheostomy modalities, including HFT [49].

One possible explanation is that, unlike high-flow nasal therapy, which reduces neuro-ventilatory drive through nasopharyngeal dead-space washout, with a modest PEEP effect, tracheal delivery bypasses

the upper-airway reservoir, in such a way that CO₂-clearing and resistance-lowering mechanisms are largely absent. Small oxygenation gains with HFT have been observed at higher tracheal flows around 50 L/min, but they remain modest and are not consistently accompanied by improvements in PaCO₂ or work of breathing [67].

Overall, current evidence does not support HFT within a standard deventilation pathway for tracheostomized adults. HFT can be considered selectively when oxygenation is low or requires high FiO₂ and humidification, but there are no robust data showing advantages on weaning duration, decannulation, or mortality.

R14: No recommendation can be made regarding active versus passive humidification during periods of ventilator liberation.

No recommendation. Strong agreement

Heating and humidifying inspired gas through the tracheostomy tube in the spontaneously breathing period during ventilator liberation is essential once the upper airways are bypassed. Adequate conditioning preserves mucociliary function and epithelial integrity and helps prevent tube or airway occlusion by secretion plugs. In this setting, humidification can be delivered with a heat-and-moisture exchanger combined with a microbiological filter (HMEF) or with a heated humidifier directly connected to the tracheostomy (High-Flow Therapy, HFT) [68]. Even though external “cool-mist” systems are outside the scope of these recommendations (they are evaluated only in post-laryngectomy care), it should be noted that in several populations, such devices were associated with more mucus plugging, pulmonary complaints (cough, expectoration), higher care needs, poorer sleep, and reduced mobility compared with HMEFs [69–71].

Choosing between HMEFs and HFT during periods of ventilator liberation cannot be determined on the basis of the limited evidence available. In a cross-over study of 10 stable tracheostomized subjects (supplemental oxygen ≤ 1 L/min), Nakanishi et al. reported adequate absolute humidity with both techniques (> 28 mg H₂O/L), with higher absolute humidity under HFT (≈ 40 mg H₂O/L) than with an HMEF (≈ 30 mg H₂O/L) [72]. However, no clinical outcome advantage has been demonstrated for the higher humidity achieved with HFT.

Clinicians should also be aware of device-to-device variability among HMEFs. Two bench studies designed for spontaneously breathing tracheostomized patients found that several HMEFs failed to deliver ≥ 28 mg H₂O/L under typical conditions, and that performance deteriorated with cold, dry oxygen supplementation and low-minute ventilation [73,74]. Because HMEF performance is affected by dry oxygen, HFT is increasingly considered for hypoxemic tracheostomized patients, but this practice remains assumption-based (improved mucociliary clearance with warmer, wetter gas) rather than evidence-based. A preliminary study in lung-transplant recipients ($n = 27$) suggested a higher decannulation rate at ICU discharge with HFT up to 60 L/min versus oxygen via HMEF (93% vs 46%, $p = 0.01$), and good tolerance of tracheal HFT, but the small, nonrandomized design and specific case-mix limit generalizability [75].

Adequately powered trials are needed to compare these gas-conditioning strategies in spontaneously breathing tracheostomized adults, with outcomes that matter clinically: progress of ventilator weaning and readiness for decannulation; patient-reported comfort, dyspnoea, sputum clearance, and sleep quality; incidence of tube occlusion; gas exchange and work of breathing; nursing workload (suctioning, early mobilization); and, importantly, cost and environmental impact.

R15: There is no evidence to recommend application of a standardized ventilator-liberation protocol.

No recommendation. Strong agreement

Most of the evidence on weaning protocols comes from intubated, sedated patients; its applicability to tracheostomized adults in the weaning phase, who are more awake and for whom restoration of laryngeal airflow, phonation, and swallowing are central, is limited [76]. Moreover, the data specific to tracheostomized patients are too heterogeneous to support or refute a standardized ventilator-liberation protocol. The only randomized trial similar to a “protocolized” strategy evaluated discrete components (cuff deflation and tube downsizing) within an otherwise identically structured program in both arms; it essentially tested increasing effective airway space around the tube, rather than “protocol versus no protocol” [41]. Physiologic studies conducted during disconnection report modest or neutral effects of oxygen-delivery modalities on ventilatory load and respiratory drive, underscoring variability by patient phenotype and timing in the weaning trajectory [77–81]. Accordingly, current evidence does not support issuing a recommendation for a standardized ventilator-liberation protocol in tracheostomized adults. Certain components can nevertheless be standardized locally (e.g.: daily assessment, spontaneous breathing sessions, cuff deflation, occlusion trials with a one-way speaking valve). In this context, standardized protocols can be implemented as part of local quality-improvement initiatives; a recent single-centre quality-improvement initiative implemented a standardized tracheostomy weaning protocol and reported a reduction in the median duration of mechanical ventilation after tracheostomy (from 17 to 10.6 days), along with a shorter ICU length of stay (-4.3 days) [82]. Future studies should explicitly compare with versus without protocol, using robust outcomes such as post-tracheostomy ventilation duration, complications, ICU and hospital length of stay, decannulation rate, and mortality.

R16: For tracheostomized patients tolerating a phase of off-ventilator breathing, threshold-loading inspiratory-muscle training should probably not be used.

Grade 2–. Strong agreement

Five randomized controlled trials (RCTs) ($n = 385$) and one prospective study ($n = 10$) were identified [83–88]. The Inspiratory Muscle Training (IMT) programs used a fixed- or variable-threshold valve attached to the tracheostomy, generating inspiratory load when the patient was off the ventilator. No study evaluated changes to ventilator trigger settings. IMT was delivered 1–2 times/day, 5–7 days/week, for 30–60 repetitions per session. Resistance was fixed or adjustable, individualized from $P_{i,max}$ (about 30% at initiation), and re-titrated from daily to weekly. All patients underwent daily off-ventilator sessions in both groups aimed at determining the longest tolerated duration with predefined stopping criteria, which could be considered as a kind of IMT.

Across studies, results were discordant for weaning success (4 RCTs, $n = 364$) and mortality (2 RCTs, $n = 191$) [83,84,86,87]. There was no change in weaning duration (3 RCTs, $n = 236$) [83,84,86]. IMT had no impact on total duration of mechanical ventilation (4 RCTs, $n = 284$) or on ICU length of stay (2 RCTs, $n = 194$) [83,84,86,87]. Most trials did not show increased inspiratory-muscle strength with IMT (5 RCTs, $n = 385$) [83,84,86,87]. If its efficiency remains unproven, safety seems to be uncompromised, insofar as only mild, transient destabilizations, chiefly respiratory, were reported during IMT sessions; no serious adverse events occurred [83,86,88].

It should be noted that a single RCT with 104 patients reported positive findings across all evaluated outcomes, but the risk of bias was moderate due to the randomization process. Baseline imbalance in arousal level (62% vs 30% awake in favour of the IMT arm) could have influenced the conduct of off-ventilator sessions to the

disadvantage of the control group [84]. Overall, compared with daily maximally tolerated off-ventilator sessions, IMT does not provide benefits.

R17: There is not enough data on clinical outcome to recommend instrumental cough-assistance techniques.

No recommendation. Strong agreement

Because of the limited data available in tracheotomized patients undergoing weaning in an intensive care setting, no specific recommendations can be issued. However, insights may be extrapolated from studies on extubation in ICU and on patients with neuromuscular disorders not involved in a weaning process.

When drawing a parallel between decannulation failures and extubation failure, identifying patients who may require respiratory or cough assistance remains challenging [89,90]. Critically ill patients receiving mechanical ventilation via endotracheal intubation often have impaired airway clearance during intubation and after extubation because of ineffective cough and respiratory-muscle weakness or paralysis related to ICU-acquired weakness [91–93]. Excess respiratory secretions are a primary cause of extubation failure in ICUs and can delay extubation [94]. In routine practice outside the ICU context in patients with neuromuscular disease with or without tracheostomy, different kinds of airway clearance techniques such as mechanical insufflation–exsufflation (MI-E) are commonly initiated when peak cough flow (PCF) is <270 L/min [95]. MI-E delivers positive-pressure insufflation immediately followed by negative pressure to generate rapid expiratory flow and assist sputum clearance [95]. In a Cochrane review including intubated and tracheostomized patients in ICUs, very low-quality evidence suggested that cough-augmentation techniques might shorten the duration of mechanical ventilation without increasing harm, but overall evidence was insufficient to determine effects on weaning success, ventilation and weaning duration, tracheostomy and decannulation rates, length of stay, or mortality [96]. A recent scoping review in invasively ventilated critically ill adults (28 studies, only four including tracheostomized patients) highlighted marked heterogeneity in how MI-E is applied and reported, limiting the feasibility of any best-practice recommendations [97].

R18: No recommendation can be made on trans-laryngeal airflow techniques to restore phonation in patients who remain mechanically ventilated with the cuff inflated.

No recommendation. Strong agreement

This recommendation applies to interventions that restore upper-airway airflow through the larynx while patients remain invasively ventilated: (i) in-line one-way speaking valves used with the cuff deflated and appropriate ventilator adjustments; (ii) above-cuff vocalization (ACV), (iii) leaked ventilation with cuff deflated. Across studies, evidence is dominated by feasibility/physiology with heterogeneous protocols and few comparative clinical endpoints, as underscored by a multinational qualitative study highlighting wide practice variation, implementation uncertainty, and the need for standardized ACV procedures and competencies [98].

In-line one-way speaking valves are used during mechanical ventilation with cuff deflated. An Australian cardiothoracic ICU series reported improved communication without prolonging ventilation time and showed signals of improved ventilation distribution and recruitment on electrical impedance tomography in 20 patients [52]. A systematic review concluded that most published work centres on feasibility, tolerance, and physiology, with limited controlled data on patient-important outcomes [99].

ACV is the only way to produce speaking with the cuff inflated by adding an adjusted 1–4 L/min gas flow on the above cuff line made for secretion aspiration. Gas flow is directed through the upper airway,

across the vocal cords, to allow phonation. Early descriptions and a service evaluation demonstrated technical feasibility and safety when delivered by trained teams under protocolized conditions [100,101]. A hospital-wide pre–post implementation associated ACV with earlier return of speech and no major complications, while not proving causality [102]. In ventilated patients unable to tolerate cuff deflation, a randomized controlled trial of a talking tracheostomy tube improved voice-related quality of life, again without effects on weaning/decannulation endpoints [103]. Overall, across modalities, the literature is heterogeneous, mainly single-centre, and primarily physiologic/implementation-focused; robust comparative data on weaning duration, decannulation, ICU/hospital length of stay, or infection remain insufficient and inconsistent [99,104].

Phonation with cuff deflation and ventilator adjustments (usually volume assist–control with increased V_t /PEEP and longer T_i) may be feasible in chronic neuromuscular disease (e.g., high cervical spinal cord injury), in which airway protection is preserved and sufficient tidal volume can be delivered despite cuff deflation. Speech often occurs during inspiration. Use is uncommon and evidence is limited. Consequently, no recommendation can be issued for routine use during mechanical ventilation.

R19: No recommendation can be made regarding the use of fenestrated tracheostomy tubes.

No recommendation. Strong agreement

Fenestrated tracheostomy tubes incorporate an opening in the outer curve of the cannula that permits expiratory flow to be redirected toward the larynx and thereby enables phonation. The fenestrated inner canula is usually coupled with cuff deflation so that gas can reach the upper airway.

The clinical literature suggests that a cannula with fenestration can help to restore voice in selected patients, but with a low level of evidence. In a 10-year retrospective series, 2000 tracheostomized patients were evaluated, but only 15 had a fenestrated cannula: 13/15 patients received a fenestrated tube for phonation issues and 12/13 achieved audible speech; 9 (60%) patients developed complications, most likely granulation [105]. A contemporary synthesis of ICU communication devices, covering in-line or tracheostomy speaking valves, and tube designs (fenestrated tube, cuff tight-to-shaft...) confirms that multiple routes to voice are available and that secretion burden and upper-airway patency are major determinants of audibility and clarity rather than the device alone [106]. Effects on resource use are mixed: across observational reports and small case series (often $n < 20$), there is no consistent indication of shorter ICU/hospital stays or faster decannulation, with outcomes largely reflecting case mix and severity [105,106].

Safety concerns are prominent and must be weighed carefully. In the Pandian cohort, 9/15 (60%) developed complications, granulation alone or in combination with tracheomalacia and/or tracheal stenosis [105]. In a large secondary analysis of hospital records (6,400 consultations, 4,284 adults), fenestrated tubes were rare ($n = 17$) but they were significantly associated with tracheostomy-related pressure injury [107]. Mechanistically, malalignment of the window [32], sharp edges at the fenestration, secretion crusting, and cuff interactions can contribute to mucosal injury, reinforcing the need for meticulous selection, sizing, humidification, and surveillance.

Fenestrated tubes are described as a potential option to help restore voice and promote one-way speaking valves or capping; however, the evidence base is limited to small, single-centre series, with no comparative data demonstrating earlier phonation, shorter length of stay, or faster decannulation versus other strategies [105–107]. In two studies, safety concerns connected with fenestrated tubes are non-trivial, with high rates of granulation and airway injury reported and an association with tracheostomy-related pressure injury [105,107].

R20: The experts suggest initiating swallowing management early, rather than delaying while awaiting specialist input.

Expert opinion, strong agreement

Among ICU subgroups, tracheostomized patients are at particularly high risk of dysphagia [108–111]. Prevalence may reach 93% [113]. Decannulation may fail in up to 41% of tracheostomized patients undergoing prolonged weaning, with severe dysphagia identified as the primary cause in 64% of cases [112].

Despite recognition of these risks, dysphagia management is often delayed and not well-codified. International surveys highlight major organizational gaps: only 4%–20% of ICUs have access to dedicated dysphagia specialists, and formalized protocols are lacking in most centres [113–115]. In a retrospective study on tracheostomized patients, some of whom were in ICUs, speech-language therapy began a median of 14 days after tracheostomy, with oral-intake decisions occurring accordingly late: oral intake took place 15 days after tracheostomy [116].

While prospective data specific to tracheostomized populations are lacking, indirect evidence supports early intervention. In post-extubation dysphagia, each day of delayed therapy increases the risk of persistent dysphagia or in-hospital mortality (adjusted OR 1.09; 95% CI, 1.02–1.18; $p = 0.009$), and is associated with dysphagia or death at days 7, 14, and 28 [117]. In a retrospective study about non-tracheostomized patients with stroke, delays >24 h in dysphagia assessment were associated with a 3% absolute increase in aspiration pneumonia; the most belatedly assessed patients had nearly twice the risk (adjusted OR 1.98; 95% CI, 1.67–2.35) [118].

Although high-quality evidence on the specific benefit of early specialist involvement in critical tracheostomized patients is lacking and even if studies of multidisciplinary approaches remain heterogeneous, the rationale for early screening is supported by the postulated risk of delaying and questions on implementation feasibility. Several bedside tools have been validated to detect aspiration in critical-care settings and are used by trained ICU clinicians (nurses, physicians, allied health) ([119–120,121]). In the absence of broad specialist availability, early screening and initial management by trained ICU staff represents a clinically grounded and operationally realistic response to a well-documented high-risk condition. This approach prioritizes patient safety through timely risk identification while optimizing available specialized resources through appropriate triage and referral pathways.

R21: The experts suggest that gastrostomy should not be systematic but should be considered in light of nutritional status and swallowing assessment.

Expert opinion, strong agreement

In adults with dysphagia, gastrostomy is typically considered when enteral feeding is expected to last >4 weeks. A meta-analysis shows fewer intervention failures than with a nasogastric tube (dislodgement/occlusion), better adherence and quality of life, and a more favourable course of nutritional markers (albumin, mid-arm circumference) ([122]). The ESPEN 2018 and ASPEN 2021 ICU nutrition guidelines do not make a specific recommendation regarding gastrostomy placement in adult intensive care, reflecting an insufficient level of evidence in this setting [123,124]. In neurology, ESPEN suggests early percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) in stroke patients ventilated for >48 h (consensus 85%), a recommendation that targets a neurological subgroup rather than the post-tracheostomy weaning pathway [123]. In neurocritical cohorts where tracheostomy and gastrostomy are often paired, several retrospective series evaluating early vs late PEG suggest shorter ICU and hospital stays with the early strategy, but interpretation is limited by severity bias and health-system organization (North American models), with

no consistent signal on duration of ventilation, decannulation, pneumonia, or mortality [125–128].

The relevant randomized controlled trials are not specific to tracheostomized patients: in ventilated stroke/traumatic brain injury intubated patients, very early PEG reduced the incidence of ventilator-associated pneumonia from 38% to 10% over three weeks, without an effect on mortality [129]. Two small-scale RCTs on mixed population, gastroesophageal reflux during mechanical ventilation through orotracheal tube report discordant results: negative [130] versus positive in a highly selected cohort with proven reflux and recurrent ventilator-associated pneumonia [131]. The hypothesis that early removal of the nasogastric tube might be beneficial (less iatrogenic dysphagia) is plausible when post-ICU dysphagia and its consequences are taken into account, but it has not been demonstrated specifically in tracheostomized patients undergoing weaning.

In tracheostomized adults undergoing weaning, the available evidence does not justify routine gastrostomy at the time of tracheostomy. The decision should be individualized by assessment of swallowing and aspiration risk, nutritional status, anticipated duration of non-oral feeding and weaning trajectory.

R22: Endoscopy before decannulation should probably not be systematically performed.

Grade 2–. Strong agreement

Fibreoptic endoscopic evaluation of swallowing (FEES) is a versatile, high-yield tool because it directly characterizes dysphagia and upper-airway obstacles relevant to decannulation. When combined with clinical assessments (capping/occlusion trials, level of arousal and tone, cough), studies report very good sensitivity/specificity for predicting decannulation success [132]. There are nonetheless two reasons not to place it first-line: first, in most series described up until now, the decannulation decision was contingent on the FEES result, making it impossible to compare alternative assessments on complications or failure; second, several authors argue that the current “gold standard” thresholds may be overly conservative for swallowing [133,134]. When instrumental evaluation is unavailable, structured clinical assessment and dye tests remain useful and show positive correlation with FEES despite heterogeneous protocols [135]. The blue-dye test, however, has debatable sensitivity; it should be performed with the cuff deflated and the tracheostomy occluded (finger, one-way valve, cap) and repeated so as to reduce false negatives [136,137].

Most studies combine FEES with clinical evaluation (capping tolerance, arousal/tonus, cough) to guide decannulation. Laryngo-tracheal lesions, of which the incidence increases with tracheostomy duration, weigh on decannulation prognosis; FEES is valuable as a means of identifying them and directing management (medical, surgical, or cannula adjustment). However, these lesions are often pauci-symptomatic and, in and of themselves, do not preclude successful decannulation [138–141]. Several cohorts have consistently proposed decannulation protocols without routine FEES, using occlusion/capping to unmask persistent upper-airway obstruction or dysphagia; reported failure rates are low, with FEES reserved for intolerance to capping or unexpected setbacks [142–144].

In ICU settings, transient dysphagia is frequent [113]. Pragmatically, FEES should be positioned as second-line, when occlusion/capping is not tolerated or when dysphagia fails to improve despite appropriate therapy; clinical screening and capping nonetheless remain the first step. Randomized studies are needed to compare clinical-first versus instrument-first strategies on patient-important outcomes.

R23: For tracheostomized patients weaned from mechanical ventilation, without major swallowing disorder and after verifying upper-airway patency, the decision to decannulate should probably be guided by the frequency of airway suctioning rather than conditioned on the success of a standardized 24-h capping trial

Grade 2+. Strong agreement

Many protocols condition decannulation on a patient's ability to tolerate complete tracheostomy occlusion, with widely varying target durations [145]. The theoretical rationale is threefold: (1) to verify upper-airway patency; (2) to re-affect the upper airways and thereby promote restoration of swallowing; and (3) to confirm the ability to breathe through the suprastomal dead space [48,50,99]. However, a speaking valve or a cap can increase ventilatory load: suprastomal dead space alone accounts for ~30% additional work of breathing [146], compounded by resistance from the reduced tracheal lumen created by the tube itself. In frail patients, this additional resistive load can contribute to decannulation failures or prolonged weaning.

A prospective ICU randomized controlled trial included 330 tracheostomized patients weaned from mechanical ventilation [147]. Patients should successfully tolerate a 5-minute tracheostomy occlusion (capping) trial and have no severe swallowing dysfunction on a 50-mL water swallow test; both assessments are performed with the cuff deflated. In both arms, the cuff was deflated and oxygen/humidification were delivered via a tracheal interface with high flow therapy at 60 L/min. Both groups first underwent a brief capping/occlusion tolerance test to screen for upper-airway obstruction. Participants were then randomized to (i) a suction-frequency criterion for decannulation (≤ 2 suction per 8-h block over 24 h) without requiring 24 h of continuous capping, or (ii) a protocol requiring 24 h of continuous capping. In this group, capping also started on a suction-frequency criterion. The suction-frequency protocol achieved shorter weaning time (6 [5–7] vs 13 [11–14] days; absolute difference: 7 days, 95% CI 5–9), along with fewer pneumonias, fewer tracheobronchitis episodes, fewer recannulations (4 vs 9), and shorter hospital stays (48 vs 62 days). In the final analysis, prolonged capping as a gatekeeper appears unnecessary; a simple, pragmatic criterion focused on secretion burden and 5-minute occlusion, under conditions of cuff deflation and adequate humidification, is more appropriate for patients without swallowing impairment.

R24: For tracheostomized patients weaned from mechanical ventilation, experts suggest coordinated multidisciplinary interventions with team training to accelerate decannulation.

Expert opinion, strong agreement

Care of tracheostomized ICU patients involves multiple disciplines (intensivists, otolaryngologists, respiratory therapists, physical medicine and rehabilitation, physiotherapists, speech-language pathologists, nurses, dietitians, etc.) and requires specific expertise. Organizing these resources as specialized multidisciplinary teams or care “bundles” has been increasingly reported since the early 2000s. The literature comprises 18 studies: 12 historical before-and-after retrospective cohorts following implementation of multidisciplinary care, two prospective observational cohorts without a control group, one prospective observational cohort with a control group, two retrospective observational cohorts, and one narrative review/meta-analysis. Overall methodological quality is moderate to low.

Regarding time to decannulation, the overall body of evidence favours multidisciplinary care: eight studies report significant reductions [78,148–154], one study is non-significant but trends toward earlier decannulation [155], and seven are non-significant or not directly comparable [144,156–161]. For failed decannulation, only one out of eight studies shows a significant benefit [154]; the

remaining seven are non-significant or not comparable [144,149,151,156–158,160]. For ICU length of stay, three studies have reported significant reductions [78,142,151] and four show no difference [153,156,157,159]. No significant or comparable effects were found for respiratory infections [144,149,156] or mortality [144,162]. In summary, tracheostomy decannulation comprises complex processes; despite the low overall level of evidence, experts suggest promotion of coordinated multidisciplinary involvement and staff training, but further studies are necessary.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

CM and JD wrote the introduction section. CM, AWT, MR wrote the methodology section. All authors contributed to elaboration of the recommendations and to writing the rationales for the recommendations. All authors provided references. CM and JD drafted the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable

Funding

These recommendations were supported by the Intensive Care Physiotherapy Society (Société de Kinésithérapie de Réanimation, SKR) and the French Intensive Care Society (Société de Réanimation de Langue Française, SRLF).

Availability of data and material

Not applicable.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Acknowledgements

Guidelines were organized, reviewed and endorsed by the SRLF (Société de Réanimation de Langue Française) and the SKR (Société de Kinésithérapie de Réanimation). They were also endorsed by the REAGIR group (Réanimation Globale, Innovante, Réduisant la production de gaz à effet de serre).

References

- [1] Thille AW, Gacouin A, Coudroy R, Ehrmann S, Quenot JP, Nay MA, et al. Spontaneous-breathing trials with pressure-support ventilation or a T-Piece. *N Engl J Med*. 17 Nov 2022;387(20):1843–54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2209041>
- [2] Béduneau G, Pham T, Schortgen F, Piquilloud L, Zogheib E, Jonas M, et al. Epidemiology of weaning outcome according to a new definition. The WIND study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 15 Mars 2017;195(6):772–83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201602-0320OC>. PubMed PMID: 27626706.
- [3] Pham T, Heunks L, Bellani G, Madotto F, Aragao I, Béduneau G, et al. Weaning from mechanical ventilation in intensive care units across 50 countries (WEAN SAFE): a multicentre, prospective, observational cohort study. *Lancet Respir Med*. Mai 2023;11(5):465–76. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(22\)00449-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(22)00449-0)

- [4] Trouillet JL, Collange O, Belafia F, Blot F, Capellier G, Cesario E, et al. Tracheotomy in the intensive care unit: guidelines from a French expert panel: the French Intensive Care Society and the French Society of Anaesthesia and Intensive Care Medicine. *Anaesth Crit Care Pain Med*. Juin 2018;37(3):281–94, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.accpm.2018.02.012>
- [5] Martin GL, Altramont A, Mazars M, Tajahmady A, Agamaliyev E, Singer M, et al. Days spent at home and mortality after critical illness: a cluster analysis using nationwide data. *Chest*. Avr 2023;163(4):826–42, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2022.10.008>. PubMed PMID: 36257472; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC10107061.
- [6] Haywood M, Ambler G, Walker C, Arora A, Jacob T, Schilder AGM, et al. The COVIDTrach prospective cohort study on outcomes in 1982 tracheostomized COVID-19 patients during the first and second UK pandemic waves. *Sci Rep*. 2 Juil 2025;15(1):23013, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-93391-w>
- [7] Cabrio D, Vesin T, Lupieri E, Messet H, Sandu K, Piquilloud L. Early prediction of hospital outcomes in patients tracheostomized for complex mechanical ventilation weaning. *Ann Intensive Care*. 8 Août 2022;12(1):73, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13613-022-01047-z>
- [8] Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ*. 26 Avr 2008;336(7650):924–6, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD>
- [9] Fernández-García C, Alonso-Rodríguez A, Wensell-Fernández A, Martínez-Cambor P, Suárez-Mier MB, Arenas Fernández J, et al. [Randomised clinical trial to compare two tracheotomy Care methods in an Intensive Care Unit]. *Enferm Intensiva*. 2016;27(1):4–12, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enfi.2015.10.003>. PubMed PMID: 26810242.
- [10] Berrios-Torres SI, Umscheid CA, Bratzler DW, Leas B, Stone EC, Kelz RR, et al. Centers for disease control and prevention guideline for the prevention of surgical site infection, 2017. *JAMA Surg*. 1 Août 2017;152(8):784–91, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamasurg.2017.0904>. PubMed PMID: 28467526.
- [11] HAS HA de S. Pansements pour plaies suturees, à la suite d'une intervention chirurgicale-Fiche BUTS. https://www.has-sante.fr/jcms/p_3394796/fr/pansements-pour-plaies-suturees-a-la-suite-d-intervention-chirurgicale-fiche-buts.
- [12] Ahmadinegad M, Lashkarizadeh MR, Ghahreman M, Shabani M, Mokhtare M, Ahmadipour M. Efficacy of dressing with absorbent foam versus dressing with gauze in prevention of tracheostomy site infection. *Tanaffos*. 2014;13(2):13–9. PubMed PMID: 25506371; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4260068.
- [13] Moser CH, Peeler A, Long R, Schoneboom B, Budhathoki C, Pelosi PP, et al. Prevention of tracheostomy-related pressure injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Crit Care Off Publ Am Assoc Crit-Care Nurses*. 1 Nov 2022;31(6):499–507, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4037/ajcc2022659>. PubMed PMID: 36316177.
- [14] Emami Zeydi A, Parvizi A, Haddadi S, Karkhah S, Hosseini SJ, Mollaei A, et al. Effect of oral care with povidone-iodine in the prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia; a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Acad Emerg Med*. 4 Avr 2023;11(1):e31, <http://dx.doi.org/10.22037/aaem.v11i1.1874>
- [15] Rosenthal VD, Memish ZA, Bearman G. Preventing ventilator-associated pneumonia: a position paper of the International Society for Infectious Diseases, 2024 update. *Int J Infect Dis IJID Off Publ Int Soc Infect Dis*. Févr 2025;151107305, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2024.107305>. PubMed PMID: 39551087.
- [16] Vieira PC, de Oliveira RB, da Silva Mendonça TM. Should oral chlorhexidine remain in ventilator-associated pneumonia prevention bundles? *Med Intensiva*. Mai 2022;46(5):259–68, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.medine.2020.09.010>. PubMed PMID: 35598950.
- [17] Conley P, McKinsey D, Graff J, Ramsey AR. Does an oral care protocol reduce VAP in patients with a tracheostomy? *Nursing (Lond)*. Juil 2013;43(7):18–23, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.NURSE.0000428709.81378.7c>. PubMed PMID: 23778208.
- [18] Halum SL, Ting JY, Plowman EK, Belafsky PC, Harbarger CF, Postma GN, et al. A multi-institutional analysis of tracheotomy complications. *The Laryngoscope*. Janv 2012;122(1):38–45, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/lary.22364>
- [19] Fine KE, Wi MS, Kovalev V, Dong F, Wong DT. Comparing the tracheostomy dislodgement and complication rate of non-sutured neck tie to skin sutured neck tie fixation. *Am J Otolaryngol*. 2021;42(1):102791, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amjoto.2020.102791>. PubMed PMID: 33130531.
- [20] White AC, Purcell E, Urquhart MB, Joseph B, O'Connor HH. Accidental decannulation following placement of a tracheostomy tube. *Respir Care*. 1 Déc 2012;57(12):2019–25, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.01627>
- [21] Seegobin RD, van Hasselt GL. Endotracheal cuff pressure and tracheal mucosal blood flow: endoscopic study of effects of four large volume cuffs. PubMed PMID: 6423162 *Br Med J Clin Res Ed*. 31 Mars 1984;288(6422):965–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.288.6422.965>. PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1442489.
- [22] Kastanos N, Estopá Miró R, Marín Perez A, Xaubet Mir A, Agustí-Vidal A. Laryngotracheal injury due to endotracheal intubation: incidence, evolution, and predisposing factors. A prospective long-term study. *Crit Care Med*. Mai 1983;11(5):362–7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00003246-198305000-00009>. PubMed PMID: 6839788.
- [23] Loeser EA, Machin R, Colley J, Orr D, Bennett GM, Stanley TH. Postoperative sore throat—importance of endotracheal tube conformity versus cuff design. *Anesthesiology*. Déc 1978;49(6):430–2, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00000542-197812000-00010>. PubMed PMID: 727546.
- [24] Jensen PJ, Hommelgaard P, Søndergaard P, Eriksen S. Sore throat after operation: influence of tracheal intubation, intracuff pressure and type of cuff. *Br J Anaesth*. Avr 1982;54(4):453–7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bja/54.4.453>. PubMed PMID: 7066143.
- [25] Rello J, Soñora R, Jubert P, Artigas A, Rué M, Vallés J. Pneumonia in intubated patients: role of respiratory airway care. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. Juil 1996;154(1):111–5, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1164/ajrccm.154.1.8680665>. PubMed PMID: 8680665.
- [26] Lorente L, Lecuona M, Jiménez A, Lorenzo L, Roca I, Cabrera J, et al. Continuous endotracheal tube cuff pressure control system protects against ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Crit Care Lond Engl*. 21 Avr 2014;18(2):R77, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/cc13837>. PubMed PMID: 24751286; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4057071.
- [27] Nseir S, Zerimech F, Fournier C, Lubret R, Ramon P, Durocher A, et al. Continuous control of tracheal cuff pressure and microaspiration of gastric contents in critically ill patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 1 Nov 2011;184(9):1041–7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201104-0630OC>. PubMed PMID: 21836137.
- [28] Burns SM, Spillman M, Wilmoth D, Carpenter R, Turrentine B, Wiley B, et al. Are frequent inner cannula changes necessary?: A pilot study. *Heart Lung J Crit Care*. 1998;27(1):58–62, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0147-9563\(98\)90070-x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0147-9563(98)90070-x). PubMed PMID: 9493884.
- [29] Solomon DH, Wobb J, Buttaro BA, Truant A, Soliman AMS. Characterization of bacterial biofilms on tracheostomy tubes. *Laryngoscope*. Août 2009;119(8):1633–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/lary.20249>. PubMed PMID: 19504601.
- [30] Carter A, Fletcher SJ, Tuffin R. The effect of inner tube placement on resistance and work of breathing through tracheostomy tubes: a bench test. *Anaesthesia*. Mars 2013;68(3):276–82, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/anae.12094>. PubMed PMID: 23278349.
- [31] Cowan T, Op't Holt TB, Gegenheimer C, Izenberg S, Kulkarni P. Effect of inner cannula removal on the work of breathing imposed by tracheostomy tubes: a bench study. *Respir Care*. Mai 2001;46(5):460–5. PubMed PMID: 11309185.
- [32] Pryor LN, Baldwin CE, Ward EC, Cornwell PL, O'Connor SN, Chapman MJ, et al. Tracheostomy tube type and inner cannula selection impact pressure and resistance to air flow. *Respir Care*. Mai 2016;61(5):607–14, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.04396>. PubMed PMID: 26860399.
- [33] Wilson AM, Gray DM, Thomas JG. Increases in endotracheal tube resistance are unpredictable relative to duration of intubation. *Chest*. Oct 2009;136(4):1006–13, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1378/chest.08-1938>. PubMed PMID: 19411293.
- [34] Hagler DA, Traver GA. Endotracheal saline and suction catheters: sources of lower airway contamination. *Am J Crit Care Off Publ Am Assoc Crit-Care Nurses*. Nov 1994;3(6):444–7. PubMed PMID: 7834003.
- [35] Ayhan H, Tastan S, Iyigun E, Akamca Y, Arikani E, Sevim Z. Normal saline instillation before endotracheal suctioning: « What does the evidence say? What do the nurses think? »: Multimethod study. *J Crit Care*. Août 2015;30(4):762–7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrrc.2015.02.019>. PubMed PMID: 25841280.
- [36] Wang CH, Tsai JC, Chen SF, Su CL, Chen L, Lin CC, et al. Normal saline instillation before suctioning: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Aust Crit Care Off J Confed Aust Crit Care Nurses*. Sept 2017;30(5):260–5, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aucc.2016.11.001>. PubMed PMID: 27876258.
- [37] Caruso P, Denari S, Ruiz SAL, Demarzo SE, Deheinzelin D. Saline instillation before tracheal suctioning decreases the incidence of ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Crit Care Med*. Janv 2009;37(1):32–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181930026>. PubMed PMID: 19050607.
- [38] Ji YR, Kim HS, Park JH. Instillation of normal saline before suctioning in patients with pneumonia. *Yonsei Med J*. Oct 2002;43(5):607–12, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3349/ymj.2002.43.5.607>. PubMed PMID: 12402373.
- [39] Chang SJ, Kim E, Kwon YO, Im H, Park K, Kim J, et al. Benefits and harms of normal saline instillation before endotracheal suctioning in mechanically ventilated adult patients in intensive care units: a systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *Intensive Crit Care Nurs*. Oct 2023;78103477, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iccn.2023.103477>. PubMed PMID: 37384975.
- [40] Jubran A, Grant BJB, Duffner LA, Collins EG, Lanuza DM, Hoffman LA, et al. Effect of pressure support vs unassisted breathing through a tracheostomy collar on weaning duration in patients requiring prolonged mechanical ventilation: a randomized trial. *JAMA*. 20 Févr 2013;309(7):671, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.2013.159>
- [41] Hernandez G, Pedrosa A, Ortiz R, Cruz Accuaroni M del M, Cuena R, Vaquero Collado C, et al. The effects of increasing effective airway diameter on weaning from mechanical ventilation in tracheostomized patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Intensive Care Med*. Juin 2013;39(6):1063–70, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00134-013-2870-7>. PubMed PMID: 23471512.
- [42] Davis DG, Bears S, Barone JE, Corvo PR, Tucker JB. Swallowing with a tracheostomy tube in place: does cuff inflation matter? *J Intensive Care Med*. 1 Mai 2002;17(3):132–5, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/088506660201700304>
- [43] Davis DG, Bears S, Barone JE, Corvo PR, Tucker JB. Swallowing with a tracheostomy tube in place: does cuff inflation matter? *J Intensive Care Med*. Mai 2002;17(3):132–5, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/088506660201700304>
- [44] Amathieu R, Sauvat S, Reynaud P, Slavov V, Luis D, Dinca A, et al. Influence of the cuff pressure on the swallowing reflex in tracheostomized intensive care unit patients. *Br J Anaesth*. Oct 2012;109(4):578–83, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bja/aes210>. PubMed PMID: 22735302.
- [45] Suiter DM, McCullough GH, Powell PW. Effects of cuff deflation and one-way tracheostomy speaking valve placement on swallow physiology. *Dysphagia*. 2003;18(4):284–92, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00455-003-0022-x>. PubMed PMID: 14571334.
- [46] Ding R, Logemann JA. Swallow physiology in patients with trach cuff inflated or deflated: a retrospective study. *Head Neck*. Sept 2005;27(9):809–13, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hed.20248>

- [47] Prigent H, Orlikowski D, Blumen MB, Leroux K, Legrand L, Lejaille M, et al. Characteristics of tracheostomy phonation valves. *Eur Respir J*. Mai 2006;27(5):992–6, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1183/09031936.06.00009405>. PubMed PMID: 16707394.
- [48] Prigent H, Lejaille M, Terzi N, Annane D, Figere M, Orlikowski D, et al. Effect of a tracheostomy speaking valve on breathing-swallowing interaction. *Intensive Care Med*. Janv 2012;38(1):85–90, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00134-011-2417-8>. PubMed PMID: 22113817.
- [49] Combret Y, Machefert M, Prieur G, Fresnel E, Artaud-Macari E, Lamia B, et al. Impact of tracheostomy tube modalities on ventilatory mechanics: a bench study. *Intensive Care Med Exp*. 8 Juill 2024;12(1):63, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s40635-024-00648-1>.
- [50] Gallice T, Cugy E, Laimay J, Branchard O, Germain C, et al. Effect of a speaking valve on nasal airflow during tracheostomy weaning: a case series. *Neurocrit Care*. Déc 2024;41(3):1100–5, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12028-024-01966-8>. PubMed PMID: 38506973; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC11599294.
- [51] Martin KA, Cole TDK, Percha CM, Asanuma N, Mattare K, Hager DN, et al. Standard versus accelerated speaking valve placement after percutaneous tracheostomy: a randomized controlled feasibility study. *Ann Am Thorac Soc*. Oct 2021;18(10):1693–701, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1513/AnnalsATS.202010-1282OC>. PubMed PMID: 33760713; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC8522290.
- [52] Sutt AL, Caruana LR, Dunster KR, Cornwell PL, Anstey CM, Fraser JF. Speaking valves in tracheostomized ICU patients weaning off mechanical ventilation—do they facilitate lung recruitment? *Crit Care Lond Engl*. 1 Avr 2016;20:91, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13054-016-1249-x>. PubMed PMID: 27038617; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4818462.
- [53] Elperin EH, Borkgren Okonek M, Bacon M, Gerstung C, Skrzynski M. Effect of the Passy-Muir tracheostomy speaking valve on pulmonary aspiration in adults. *Heart Lung J Crit Care*. 2000;29(4):287–93, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1067/mhl.2000.106941>. PubMed PMID: 10900066.
- [54] Leder SB. Effect of a one-way tracheostomy speaking valve on the incidence of aspiration in previously aspirating patients with tracheostomy. *Dysphagia*. 1999;14(2):73–7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/PL00009590>. PubMed PMID: 10028036.
- [55] Lichtman SW, Birnbaum IL, Sanfilippo MR, Pellicone JT, Damon WJ, King ML. Effect of a tracheostomy speaking valve on secretions, arterial oxygenation, and olfaction: a quantitative evaluation. *J Speech Hear Res*. Juin 1995;38(3):549–55, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3803.549>. PubMed PMID: 7674646.
- [56] Ceron C, Otto D, Signorini AV, Beck MC, Camilis M, Sganzerla D, et al. The effect of speaking valves on ICU mobility of individuals with tracheostomy. *Respir Care*. Févr 2020;65(2):144–9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.06768>. PubMed PMID: 31615923.
- [57] REGULATION (EU) 2017/745 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 5 April 2017 on medical devices, amending Directive 2001/83/EC, Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 and Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 and repealing Council Directives 90/385/EEC and 93/42/EEC. *Official Journal of the European Union*. 2017.
- [58] Mitchell RB, Hussey HM, Setzen G, Jacobs IN, Nussenbaum B, Dawson C, et al. Clinical consensus statement: tracheostomy care. *Otolaryngol-Head Neck Surg Off J Am Acad Otolaryngol-Head Neck Surg*. Janv 2013;148(1):6–20, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014559812460376>. PubMed PMID: 22990518.
- [59] Fisher DF, Kondili D, Williams J, Hess DR, Bittner EA, Schmidt UH. Tracheostomy tube change before day 7 is associated with earlier use of speaking valve and earlier oral intake. *Respir Care*. Févr 2013;58(2):257–63, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.01714>. PubMed PMID: 22782273.
- [60] Lee S, Lee SW, Park J, Han J. Clinical outcomes according to the timing of the first tracheostomy tube change. *Heliyon*. 30 Mars 2024;10(6):e28180, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e28180>. PubMed PMID: 38545145; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC10966685.
- [61] Yaremchuk K. Regular tracheostomy tube changes to prevent formation of granulation tissue. *Laryngoscope*. Janv 2003;113(1):1–10, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00005537-200301000-00001>. PubMed PMID: 12514373.
- [62] Johnson DC, Campbell SL, Rabkin JD. Tracheostomy tube manometry: evaluation of speaking valves, capping and need for downsizing. *Clin Respir J*. Janv 2009;3(1):8–14, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-699X.2008.00100.x>. PubMed PMID: 20298366.
- [63] Wahla AS, Mallat J, Zoumot Z, Shafiq I, De Oliveira B, Uzbeck M, et al. Complications of surgical and percutaneous tracheostomies, and factors leading to decannulation success in a unique Middle Eastern population. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(7):e0236093, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0236093>. PubMed PMID: 32706784; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7380598.
- [64] Corley A, Edwards M, Spooner AJ, Dunster KR, Anstey C, Fraser JF. High-flow oxygen via tracheostomy improves oxygenation in patients weaning from mechanical ventilation: a randomised crossover study. *Intensive Care Med*. Mars 2017;43(3):465–7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00134-016-4634-7>.
- [65] Stripoli T, Spadaro S, Di Mussi R, Volta CA, Trerotoli P, De Carlo F, et al. High-flow oxygen therapy in tracheostomized patients at high risk of weaning failure. *Ann Intensive Care*. Déc 2019;9(1):4, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13613-019-0482-2>.
- [66] Lersritwimanmaen P, Rittayamai N, Tscheikuna J, J Brochard L. High-flow oxygen therapy in tracheostomized subjects with prolonged mechanical ventilation: a randomized crossover physiologic study. *Respir Care*. Mai 2021;66(5):806–13, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.08585>. PubMed PMID: 33653909.
- [67] Natalini D, Grieco DL, Santantonio MT, Mincione L, Toni F, Anzellotti GM, et al. Physiological effects of high-flow oxygen in tracheostomized patients. *Ann Intensive Care*. Déc 2019;9(1):114, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13613-019-0591-y>.
- [68] Gomaa D, Branson RD. Conditioning inspired gases for tracheostomy. *Respir Care*. Févr 2019;64(2):233–4, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.06893>. PubMed PMID: 30705146.
- [69] Ebersole B, Moran K, Gou J, Ridge J, Schiech L, Liu JC, et al. Heat and moisture exchanger cassettes: results of a quality/safety initiative to reduce postoperative mucus plugging after total laryngectomy. *Head Neck*. Sept 2020;42(9):2453–9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hed.26267>. PubMed PMID: 32445222; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7723301.
- [70] Kearney A, Norris K, Bertelsen C, Samad I, Cambridge M, Croft G, et al. Adoption and utilization of Heat and Moisture Exchangers (HMEs) in the tracheostomy patient. *Otolaryngol-Head Neck Surg Off J Am Acad Otolaryngol-Head Neck Surg*. Nov 2023;169(5):1374–81, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ohn.368>. PubMed PMID: 37161949.
- [71] Mèrol JC, Charpiot A, Langagne T, Hémar P, Ackerstaff AH, Hilgers FJM. Randomized controlled trial on postoperative pulmonary humidification after total laryngectomy: external humidifier versus heat and moisture exchanger. *Laryngoscope*. Févr 2012;122(2):275–81, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/lary.21841>. PubMed PMID: 22105893.
- [72] Nakanishi N, Oto J, Itagaki T, Nakataki E, Onodera M, Nishimura M. Humidification performance of passive and active humidification devices within a spontaneously breathing tracheostomized cohort. *Respir Care*. Févr 2019;64(2):130–5, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.06294>. PubMed PMID: 30254040.
- [73] Brusasco C, Corradi F, Vargas M, Bona M, Bruno F, Marsili M, et al. In vitro evaluation of heat and moisture exchangers designed for spontaneously breathing tracheostomized patients. *Respir Care*. Nov 2013;58(11):1878–85, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.02405>. PubMed PMID: 23674812.
- [74] Chikata Y, Oto J, Onodera M, Nishimura M. Humidification performance of humidifying devices for tracheostomized patients with spontaneous breathing: a bench study. *Respir Care*. Sept 2013;58(9):1442–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.02093>. PubMed PMID: 23386732.
- [75] Lionello F, Guarnieri G, Arcaro G, Bertagna De Marchi L, Molena B, Contessa C, et al. High-flow tracheal oxygen for tracheostomy tube removal in lung transplant recipients. *J Clin Med*. 8 Déc 2023;12(24):7566, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/jcm12247566>. PubMed PMID: 38137635; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC10743481.
- [76] Blackwood B, Burns KEA, Cardwell CR, O'Halloran P. Protocolized versus non-protocolized weaning for reducing the duration of mechanical ventilation in critically ill adult patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 6 Nov 2014;2014(11):CD006904, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD006904.pub3>. PubMed PMID: 25375085; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6517015.
- [77] van der Lely AJW, Veelo DP, Dongelmans DA, Korevaar JC, Vroom MB, Schultz MJ. Time to wean after tracheostomy differs among subgroups of critically ill patients: retrospective analysis in a mixed medical/surgical intensive care unit. *Respir Care*. Déc 2006;51(12):1408–15. PubMed PMID: 17134521.
- [78] McGrath BA, Wallace S, Lynch J, Bonvento B, Coe B, Owen A, et al. Improving tracheostomy care in the United Kingdom: results of a guided quality improvement programme in 20 diverse hospitals. *Br J Anaesth*. Juill 2020;125(1):e119–29, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2020.04.064>.
- [79] Fagoni N, Piva S, Peli E, Turla F, Pecci E, Gualdoni L, et al. Comparison between a nurse-led weaning protocol and weaning based on physician's clinical judgment in tracheostomized critically ill patients: a pilot randomized controlled clinical trial. *Ann Intensive Care*. Déc 2018;8(1):11, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13613-018-0354-1>.
- [80] Zhou T, Wang J, Zhang C, Zhang B, Guo H, Yang B, et al. Tracheostomy decannulation protocol in patients with prolonged tracheostomy referred to a rehabilitation hospital: a prospective cohort study. *J Intensive Care*. Déc 2022;10(1):34, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s40560-022-00626-3>.
- [81] Lima FCD, Neves WFDS, Dias ALDL, Mendes CP, Simor A, Pimentel IMDS, et al. Nursing care protocol for critical users with tracheostomy under mechanical ventilation. *Rev Bras Enferm*. 2024;77(2):e20230337, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0034-7167-2023-0337>.
- [82] Mikhaeil M, Bernard M, Currie J, Bolduc C, Radke J, Kranjc S, et al. Improving weaning and liberation from mechanical ventilation for tracheostomy patients: a quality improvement initiative. *BMJ Qual Saf*. Juill 2025;34(7):480–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2024-018324>.
- [83] Van Hollebeke M, Poddighe D, Hoffman M, Clerckx B, Muller J, Louvaris Z, et al. Similar weaning success rate with high-intensity and sham inspiratory muscle training: a randomized controlled trial (IMweanT). *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. Mars 2025;211(3):381–90, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1164/rccm.202405-1042OC>. PubMed PMID: 39565276.
- [84] Roceto Ratti LDS, Marques Tonella R, Castilho de Figueiredo L, Bredda Saad IA, et al. Inspiratory muscle training strategies in tracheostomized critically ill individuals. *Respir Care*. Août 2022;67(8):939–48, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.08733>. PubMed PMID: 35641000.
- [85] da Silva Guimarães B, de Souza LC, Cordeiro HF, Regis TL, Leite CA, Puga FP, et al. Inspiratory muscle training with an electronic resistive loading device improves prolonged weaning outcomes in a randomized controlled trial. *Crit Care Med*. 1 Avr 2021;49(4):589–97, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000004787>. PubMed PMID: 33332819.
- [86] Tonella RM, Ratti LDSR, Delazari LEB, Junior CF, Da Silva PL, Herran ARDS, et al. Inspiratory muscle training in the intensive care unit: a new perspective. *J*

- Clin Med Res. Nov 2017;9(11):929–34, <http://dx.doi.org/10.14740/jocmr3169w>. PubMed PMID: 29038671; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5633094.
- [87] Martin AD, Smith BK, Davenport PD, Harman E, Gonzalez-Rothi RJ, Baz M, et al. Inspiratory muscle strength training improves weaning outcome in failure to wean patients: a randomized trial. *Crit Care Lond Engl*. 2011;15(2):R84, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/cc10081>. PubMed PMID: 21385346; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3219341.
- [88] Bissett B, Leditschke IA, Green M. Specific inspiratory muscle training is safe in selected patients who are ventilator-dependent: a case series. *Intensive Crit Care Nurs*. Avr 2012;28(2):98–104, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iccn.2012.01.003>. PubMed PMID: 22340987.
- [89] Terzi N, Guerin C, Gonçalves MR. What's new in management and clearing of airway secretions in ICU patients? It is time to focus on cough augmentation. *Intensive Care Med*. 2019;1(6):865–8.
- [90] Terzi N, Lofaso F, Masson R, Beuret P, Normand H, Dumanowski E. Physiological predictors of respiratory and cough assistance needs after extubation. *Ann Intensive Care*. 2018;8.
- [91] Gonçalves MR, Honrado T, Winck JC, Paiva JA. Effects of mechanical insufflation-exsufflation in preventing respiratory failure after extubation: a randomized controlled trial. *Crit Care Lond Engl*. 12 Déc 2012;16(2):R48, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/cc11249>. PubMed PMID: 22420538; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3681374.
- [92] Smina M, Salam A, Khamiees M, Gada P, Amoaeng-Adjepong Y, Manthous CA. Cough peak flows and extubation outcomes. *Chest*. Juill 2003;124(1):262–8.
- [93] Salam A, Tilluckdharry L, Amoaeng-Adjepong Y, Manthous CA. Neurologic status, cough, secretions and extubation outcomes. *Intensive Care Med*. Juill 2004;30(7):1334–9.
- [94] Thille AW, Richard JCM, Brochard L. The decision to extubate in the intensive care unit. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2013;187(12):1294–302.
- [95] Chatwin M, Toussaint M, Gonçalves MR, Sheers N, Mellies U, Gonzales-Bermejo J. Airway clearance techniques in neuromuscular disorders: a state of the art review. *Respir Med*. Mars 2018;136:98–110.
- [96] Rose L, Adhikari N.K., Leasa D., Fergusson D.A., McKim D. Cough augmentation techniques for extubation or weaning critically ill patients from mechanical ventilation. *Cochrane Emergency and Critical Care Group, éditeur. Cochrane Database Syst Rev [Internet]*. Disponible sur: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/14651858.CD011833.pub2>.
- [97] Swingwood EL, Stlima W, Tume LN, Cramp F, Voss S, Bewley J, et al. The Use of Mechanical Insufflation-Exsufflation in Invasively Ventilated Critically Ill Adults. *Respir Care*. 2022;67(8):1043–57.
- [98] Mills CS, Michou E, Bellamy MC, Siddle HJ, Brennan CA, Bojke C. Worth a try or a last resort: healthcare professionals' experiences and opinions of above cuff vocalisation. *Int J Lang Commun Disord*. 2024;59(3):932–46, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12970>. PubMed PMID: 37902100.
- [99] O'Connor LR, Morris NR, Paratz J. Physiological and clinical outcomes associated with use of one-way speaking valves on tracheostomised patients: a systematic review. *Heart Lung J Crit Care*. 2019;48(4):356–64, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hrtlng.2018.11.006>. PubMed PMID: 30573194.
- [100] McGrath BA, Wallace S, Wilson M, Nicholson L, Felton T, Bowyer C, et al. Safety and feasibility of above cuff vocalisation for ventilator-dependant patients with tracheostomies. *J Intensive Care Soc*. Févr 2019;20(1):59–65, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1751143718767055>. PubMed PMID: 30792764; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6376581.
- [101] McGrath B, Lynch J, Wilson M, Nicholson L, Wallace S. Above cuff vocalisation: a novel technique for communication in the ventilator-dependent tracheostomy patient. *J Intensive Care Soc*. Févr 2016;17(1):19–26, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1751143715607549>. PubMed PMID: 28979454; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5606385.
- [102] Gajic S, Jacobs L, Gellentien C, Dubin RM, Ma K. Implementation of above-cuff vocalization after tracheostomy is feasible and associated with earlier speech. *Am J Speech Lang Pathol*. 3 Janv 2024;33(1):51–6, http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/2023_AJSLP-23-00184. PubMed PMID: 38056485.
- [103] Pandian V, Cole T, Kilonsky D, Holden K, Feller-Kopman DJ, Brower R, et al. Voice-related quality of life increases with a talking tracheostomy tube: a randomized controlled trial. *Laryngoscope*. Mai 2020;130(5):1249–55, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/lary.28211>. PubMed PMID: 31385620.
- [104] O'Connor LR, Morris N, Paratz J. The safety and efficacy of prolonged use of one-way speaking valves. *Aust Crit Care Off J Confed Aust Crit Care Nurses*. Juill 2021;34(4):319–26, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aucc.2020.09.003>. PubMed PMID: 33191118.
- [105] Pandian V, Boisen SE, Mathews S, Cole T. Are fenestrated tracheostomy tubes still valuable? *Am J Speech Lang Pathol*. 9 Août 2019;28(3):1019–28, http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/2019_AJSLP-18-0187. PubMed PMID: 31318610; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6802915.
- [106] Gentile MN, Irvine AD, King AM, Hembrom AS, Guruswamy KS, Palivela NE, et al. Enhancing communication in critically ill patients with a tracheostomy: a systematic review of evidence-based interventions and outcomes. *Tracheostomy Off J Glob Tracheostomy Collab*. 1 Avr 2024;1(1), <http://dx.doi.org/10.62905/001c.115440>
- [107] Moser CH, Budhathoki C, Allgood SJ, Haut ER, Brenner MJ, Pandian V. Global predictors of tracheostomy-related pressure injury in the COVID-19 era: a study of secondary data. *Intensive Crit Care Nurs*. Févr 2025;86103720, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iccn.2024.103720>
- [108] Skoretz SA, Flowers HL, Martino R. The incidence of dysphagia following endotracheal intubation: a systematic review. *Chest*. Mars 2010;137(3):665–73, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1378/chest.09-1823>. PubMed PMID: 20202948.
- [109] Macht M, White SD, Moss M. Swallowing dysfunction after critical illness. *Chest*. Déc 2014;146(6):1681–9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1378/chest.14-1133>. PubMed PMID: 25451355; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4251623.
- [110] Macht M, Wimbish T, Clark BJ, Benson AB, Burnham EL, Williams A, et al. Postextubation dysphagia is persistent and associated with poor outcomes in survivors of critical illness. *Crit Care Lond Engl*. 2011;15(5):R231, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/cc10472>. PubMed PMID: 21958475; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3334778.
- [111] Zuercher P, Moser M, Waskowski J, Pfortmueller CA, Schefold JC. Dysphagia post-extubation affects long-term mortality in mixed adult ICU patients-data from a large prospective observational study with systematic dysphagia screening. *Crit Care Explor*. Juin 2022;4(6):e0714, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/CCE.0000000000000714>. PubMed PMID: 35765374; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC9225494.
- [112] Ghiani A, Tsitouras K, Paderewska J, Milger K, Walcher S, Weiffenbach M, et al. Incidence, causes, and predictors of unsuccessful decannulation following prolonged weaning. *Ther Adv Chronic Dis*. 2022;1320406223221109655, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/20406223221109655>. PubMed PMID: 35959504; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC9358569.
- [113] Spronk PE, Spronk LEJ, Egerod I, McGaughey J, McRae J, Rose L, et al. Dysphagia in Intensive Care Evaluation (DICE): an international cross-sectional survey. *Dysphagia*. Déc 2022;37(6):1451–60, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00455-021-10389-y>. PubMed PMID: 35092486.
- [114] Zuercher P, Moret C, Schefold JC. Dysphagia in the intensive care unit in Switzerland (DICE) - results of a national survey on the current standard of care. *Swiss Med Wkly*. 15 Juill 2019;149w20111, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4414/smw.2019.20111>. PubMed PMID: 31330036.
- [115] van Snippenburg W, Kröner A, Flim M, Hofhuis J, Buise M, Hemler R, et al. Awareness and management of dysphagia in dutch intensive care units: a nationwide survey. *Dysphagia*. Avr 2019;34(2):220–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00455-018-9930-7>. PubMed PMID: 30069599.
- [116] Freeman-Sanderson A, Togher L, Phipps P, Elkins M. A clinical audit of the management of patients with a tracheostomy in an Australian tertiary hospital intensive care unit: Focus on speech-language pathology. *Int J Speech Lang Pathol*. Déc 2011;13(6):518–25, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/17549507.2011.582520>. PubMed PMID: 21936760.
- [117] Hongo T, Yamamoto R, Liu K, Yaguchi T, Dote H, Saito R, et al. Association between timing of speech and language therapy initiation and outcomes among post-extubation dysphagia patients: a multicenter retrospective cohort study. *Crit Care Lond Engl*. 8 Avr 2022;26(1):98, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13054-022-03974-6>. PubMed PMID: 35395802; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC8991938.
- [118] Bray BD, Smith CJ, Cloud GC, Enderby P, James M, Paley L, et al. The association between delays in screening for and assessing dysphagia after acute stroke, and the risk of stroke-associated pneumonia. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. Janv 2017;88(1):25–30, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2016-313356>. PubMed PMID: 27298147.
- [119] Martínez de Lagrán Zurbano I, Laguna LB, Soria CV, Guisasola CP, Marcos-Neira P. Utility of the modified Volume-Viscosity Swallow Test for bedside screening of dysphagia in critically ill patients. *Clin Nutr ESPEN*. Févr 2023;53:214–23, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clnesp.2022.12.021>. PubMed PMID: 36657916.
- [120] Troll C, Trapl-Grundschober M, Teuschl Y, Cerrito A, Compte MG, Siegmund M. A bedside Swallowing Screen for the identification of post-extubation dysphagia on the intensive care unit - validation of the Gugging Swallowing Screen (GUSS)-ICU. *BMC Anesthesiol*. 13 Avr 2023;23(1):122, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12871-023-02072-6>. PubMed PMID: 37055724; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC10099025.
- [121] Belafsky PC, Blumenfeld L, LePage A, Nahrstedt K. The accuracy of the modified Evan's blue dye test in predicting aspiration. *Laryngoscope*. Nov 2003;113(11):1969–72, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00005537-200311000-00021>. PubMed PMID: 14603057.
- [122] Gomes CAR, Andriolo RB, Bennett C, Lustosa SAS, Matos D, Waisberg DR, et al. Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy versus nasogastric tube feeding for adults with swallowing disturbances. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 22 Mai 2015;2015(5):CD008096, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD008096.pub4>. PubMed PMID: 25997528; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6464742.
- [123] Burgos R, Bretón I, Cereda E, Desport JC, Dzievas R, Genton L, et al. ESPEN guideline clinical nutrition in neurology. *Clin Nutr Edinb Scotl*. Févr 2018;37(1):354–96, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2017.09.003>. PubMed PMID: 29274834.
- [124] Compher C, Bingham AL, McCall M, Patel J, Rice TW, Braunschweig C, et al. Guidelines for The provision of Nutrition support Therapy in The adult critically ill patient: The American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. Janv 2022;46(1):12–41, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jpen.2267>. PubMed PMID: 34784064.
- [125] D'Amelio LF, Hammond JS, Spain DA, Sutyak JP. Tracheostomy and percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy in the management of the head-injured trauma patient. *Am Surg*. Mars 1994;60(3):180–5. PubMed PMID: 8116977.
- [126] Noblezza COS, Pandian V, Jasti R, Wu DH, Mirski MA, Geocadin RG. Outcomes of tracheostomy with concomitant and delayed percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy in the neuroscience critical care unit. *J Intensive Care Med*. Oct 2019;34(10):835–43, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0885066617718492>. PubMed PMID: 28675111.
- [127] Hochu G, Soule S, Lenart E, Howley IW, Filiberto D, Byerly S. Synchronous tracheostomy and gastrostomy placement results in shorter length of stay in

- traumatic brain injury patients. *Am J Surg.* Janv 2024;227:153–6, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2023.10.012>. PubMed PMID: 37852846.
- [128] McCann MR, Hatton KW, Vsevolozhskaya OA, Fraser JF. Earlier tracheostomy and percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy in patients with hemorrhagic stroke: associated factors and effects on hospitalization. *J Neurosurg.* 1 Janv 2020;132(1):87–93, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3171/2018.7.JNS181345>. PubMed PMID: 30611136.
- [129] Kostadima E, Kaditis AG, Alexopoulos EI, Zakynthinos E, Sfyas D. Early gastrostomy reduces the rate of ventilator-associated pneumonia in stroke or head injury patients. *Eur Respir J.* Juill 2005;26(1):106–11, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1183/09031936.05.00096104>. PubMed PMID: 15994396.
- [130] Roy PM, Person B, Souday V, Kerkeni N, Dib N, Asfar P. Percutaneous radiologic gastrostomy versus nasogastric tube in critically ill patients. *Clin Nutr Edinb Scotl. Avr 2005;24(2):321–5*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2004.11.006>. PubMed PMID: 15784495.
- [131] Douzinas EE, Dimitrakopoulos A, Diamanti-Kandarakis E, Rapidis AD, Roussos C. Effect of percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy on gastro-esophageal reflux in mechanically-ventilated patients. *World J Gastroenterol.* 7 Janv 2006;12(1):114–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v12.i1.114>. PubMed PMID: 16440428; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4077500.
- [132] Enrichi C, Battel I, Zanetti C, Koch I, Ventura L, Palmer K, et al. Clinical criteria for tracheostomy decannulation in subjects with acquired brain injury. *Respir Care.* Oct 2017;62(10):1255–63, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.05470>. PubMed PMID: 28698267.
- [133] Muñoz-Garach M, Moreno-Romero O, Ramirez-Puerta R, Yuste-Ossorio E, Quintana-Luque F, Muñoz-Torres M, et al. Accuracy of modified blue-dye testing in predicting dysphagia in tracheostomized critically ill patients. *Diagn Basel Switz.* 7 Févr 2023;13(4):616, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/diagn13040616>. PubMed PMID: 36832104; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC9955006.
- [134] Hales PA, Drinnan MJ, Wilson JA. The added value of fiberoptic endoscopic evaluation of swallowing in tracheostomy weaning. *Clin Otolaryngol Off J ENT-UK Off J Neth Soc Oto-Rhino-Laryngol Cervico-Facial Surg.* Août 2008;33(4):319–24, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-4486.2008.01757.x>. PubMed PMID: 18983340.
- [135] Béchet S, Hill F, Gilheaney Ó, Walshe M. Diagnostic accuracy of the modified Evan's blue dye test in detecting aspiration in patients with tracheostomy: a systematic review of the evidence. *Dysphagia.* Déc 2016;31(6):721–9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00455-016-9737-3>. PubMed PMID: 27530728.
- [136] O'Neil-Pirozzi TM, Lisiecki DJ, Jack Momose K, Connors JJ, Milliner MP. Simultaneous modified barium swallow and blue dye tests: a determination of the accuracy of blue dye test aspiration findings. *Dysphagia.* 2003;18(1):32–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00455-002-0081-4>. PubMed PMID: 12497194.
- [137] Fiorelli A, Ferraro F, Nagar F, Fusco P, Mazzone S, Costa G, et al. A new modified Evans Blue dye test as screening test for aspiration in tracheostomized patients. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth.* Avr 2017;31(2):441–5, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1053/j.jvca.2016.07.031>. PubMed PMID: 27720495.
- [138] Law JH, Barnhart K, Rowlett W, de la Rocha O, Lowenberg S. Increased frequency of obstructive airway abnormalities with long-term tracheostomy. *Chest.* Juill 1993;104(1):136–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1378/chest.104.1.136>. PubMed PMID: 8325056.
- [139] Lanini B, Binazzi B, Romagnoli I, Chellini E, Pianigiani L, Tofani A, et al. Tracheostomy decannulation in severe acquired brain injury patients: the role of flexible bronchoscopy. *Pulmonology.* Déc 2023;29 Suppl 4:S80–5, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pulmoe.2021.05.006>. PubMed PMID: 34219041.
- [140] Hakiki B, Draghi F, Pancani S, Portaccio E, Grippo A, Binazzi B, et al. Decannulation after a severe acquired brain injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* Nov 2020;101(11):1906–13, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2020.05.004>. PubMed PMID: 32428445.
- [141] Gallice T, Cugy E, Branchard O, Dehail P, Moucheboeuf G. Predictive factors for successful decannulation in patients with tracheostomies and brain injuries: a systematic review. *Dysphagia.* Août 2024;39(4):552–72, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00455-023-10646-2>. PubMed PMID: 38189928; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC11239766.
- [142] Pandian V, Miller CR, Schiavi AJ, Yarmus L, Contractor A, Haut ER, et al. Utilization of a standardized tracheostomy capping and decannulation protocol to improve patient safety. *Laryngoscope.* Août 2014;124(8):1794–800, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/lary.24625>. PubMed PMID: 24473939.
- [143] Singh RK, Saran S, Baronia AK. The practice of tracheostomy decannulation-a systematic review. *J Intensive Care.* 2017;5:38, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s40560-017-0234-z>. PubMed PMID: 28649385; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5477679.
- [144] Gallice T, Cugy E, Germain C, Barthélemy C, Laimay J, Gaube J, et al. A pluridisciplinary tracheostomy weaning protocol for brain-injured patients, outside of the intensive care unit and without instrumental assessment: results of pilot study. *Dysphagia.* Août 2024;39(4):608–22, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00455-023-10641-7>. PubMed PMID: 38062168; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC11239749.
- [145] Medeiros GCD, Sassi FC, Lirani-Silva C, Andrade CRFD. Critérios para decanulação da traqueostomia: revisão de literatura. *CoDAS.* 2019;31(6):e20180228, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/2317-1782/20192018228>.
- [146] Chadda K, Louis B, Benaïssa L, Annane D, Gajdos P, Raphaël J, et al. Physiological effects of decannulation in tracheostomized patients. *Intensive Care Med.* 2002;28(12):1761–7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00134-002-1545-6>.
- [147] Hernández Martínez G, Rodríguez ML, Vaquero MC, Ortiz R, Masclans JR, Roca O, et al. High-flow oxygen with capping or suctioning for tracheostomy decannulation. *N Engl J Med.* 10 Sept 2020;383(11):1009–17, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2010834>. PubMed PMID: 32905673.
- [148] Bianchi A, Barbara M, Monini S. Selective rehabilitative approach to neurological dysfunctions of the oro-pharyngo-laryngeal trivium. *Acta Otolaryngol (Stockh).* Nov 2014;134(11):1172–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/00016489.2014.936626>.
- [149] Frank U, Mäder M, Sticher H. Dysphagic patients with tracheotomies: a multidisciplinary approach to treatment and decannulation management. *Dysphagia.* 1 Févr 2007;22(1):20–9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00455-006-9036-5>.
- [150] Cetto R, Arora A, Hettige R, Nel M, Benjamin L, Gomez CMH, et al. Improving tracheostomy care: a prospective study of the multidisciplinary approach. *Clin Otolaryngol.* Oct 2011;36(5):482–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-4486.2011.02379.x>.
- [151] Zivi I, Valsecchi R, Maestri R, Maffia S, Zarucchi A, Molatore K, et al. Early rehabilitation reduces time to decannulation in patients with severe acquired brain injury: a retrospective study. *Front Neurol.* 10 Juill 2018;9:59, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2018.00559>.
- [152] Bjerrum K, Grove LMD, Mortensen SS, Fabricius J. Development and effect evaluation of an action-oriented interdisciplinary weaning protocol for cuffed tracheostomy tubes in patients with acquired brain injury. *Healthcare.* 16 Févr 2024;12(4):480, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/healthcare12040480>.
- [153] Speed L, Harding KE. Tracheostomy teams reduce total tracheostomy time and increase speaking valve use: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Crit Care.* Avr 2013;28(2):216.e1–216.e10, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2012.05.005>.
- [154] Mah JW, Staff II, Fisher SR, Butler KL. Improving decannulation and swallowing function: a comprehensive, multidisciplinary approach to post-tracheostomy care. *Respir Care.* 1 Févr 2017;62(2):137–43, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.04878>.
- [155] Tobin AE, Santamaria JD. An intensivist-led tracheostomy review team is associated with shorter decannulation time and length of stay: a prospective cohort study. *Crit Care.* 11 Avr 2008;12(2):R48, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/cc6864>.
- [156] Berney L, Wasserfallen JB, Grant K, Levivier M, Simon C, Faouzi M, et al. Acute neurorhabilitation: does a neurosensory and coordinated interdisciplinary programme reduce tracheostomy weaning time and weaning failure? *NeuroRehabilitation.* 26 Juin 2014;34(4):809–17, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3233/NRE-141081>.
- [157] Southcott AM, Holdsworth C, Malcolm L, Muruganandan S, Skinner E. Evaluation of the implementation of a Tracheostomy Review Services (TRS): an observational cohort study. *J Interprof Care.* 2 Nov 2019;33(6):697–705, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13561820.2019.1566216>.
- [158] Alhashemi H, Algarni M, Al-Hakami H, Seeban N, Hussain T, Bhutto T, et al. An interdisciplinary approach to the management of individuals with tracheostomy. *Respir Care.* 1 Janv 2022;67(1):34–9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4187/respcare.08869>.
- [159] Twose P, Jones G, Lowes J, Morgan P. Enhancing care of patients requiring a tracheostomy: a sustained quality improvement project. *J Crit Care.* Déc 2019;54:191–6, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2019.08.030>.
- [160] De Mestral C. Impact of a specialized multidisciplinary tracheostomy team on tracheostomy care in critically ill patients. *Can J Surg.* 1 Juin 2011;54(3):167–72, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1503/cjs.043209>.
- [161] Welton C, Morrison M, Catalig M, Chris J, Pataki J. Can an interprofessional tracheostomy team improve weaning to decannulation times? A quality improvement evaluation. *Can J Respir Ther CJRT Rev Can Ther Respir RCTR.* 2016;52(1):7–11. PubMed PMID: 26909008; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4751971.
- [162] Pandian V, Miller CR, Mirski MA, Schiavi AJ, Morad AH, Vaswani RS, et al. Interdisciplinary team approach in the management of tracheostomy patients. *Otolaryngol Neck Surg.* Oct 2012;147(4):684–91, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0194599812449995>.