Annotated Nursing Literature on Chest Drainage

Comprehensive, referenced review of care of patients with chest tubes from indications, to tube insertion, types of drains, tube and drain management, patient assessment and tube removal.

Systematic review of the literature relating to chest drain care, specifically: dressings, tube manipulation and positioning, and tube removal.

Crawford D: Care and nursing management of a child with a chest drain. *Nursing Children and Young People* 2011;23(10):27-34.
Comprehensive review of care of children with chest tubes including indications (with a focus on pneumothorax), patient assessment, chest tube insertion, tube and drain management and removal with special attention to particular needs of children; includes questions with activities to apply content to practice

Descriptive trial of digital drain use in thoracic surgery

The classic reference that first identified very high negative pressures with chest tube stripping demonstrated pressures between -145 cmH2O and -370 cmH2O depending on length of tube compressed and -145 cmH2O -408 cmH2O when roller was compared to manual technique; pleural pressures were higher than mediastinal pressures. Study measurements were done on 20 men who had postoperative pleural or mediastinal chest tubes; measurements were taken at the juncture of the chest tube and the drainage tubing; suction to the drain was -20 cmH2O

This study compared standard care with venting and sump drainage; all chest tubing was stripped with a roller. Chest drains today automatically vent excess negative pressure in the system. This study did not compare tube manipulation techniques.

Review of nursing care for patients with chest tubes: tube insertion, managing the chest drain, complications and tube removal

Study of 15 thoracic surgery patients; patients were not well prepared preop and had significant pain directly related to chest tube

Bench test of pressure and drainage through chest drain tubing in various configurations; demonstrates hazards of dependent loops

Compares traditional practices with evidence-based practices relating to suction levels, manipulating chest drain tubing, positioning tubing

This comprehensive, extensively referenced review examines the state of the art of nursing care in 1993, including indications; tube placement; drainage systems; principles relating to
Evidence-Based Care of Patients with Chest Tubes

- chest drainage; controversies including mediastinal bleeding, tube clearance, clamping, tube site care, antibiotics; chest tube removal; complications; and autotransfusion


This clinical evidence review examines the literature relating to drainage tube manipulation and finds no research supporting the practice


Milking compared with stripping showed no difference in drainage in cardiac surgery patients; statistical analysis also showed no difference in drainage between suction pressures of -5 cmH2O and -20 cmH2O

Kirkwood P: Are chest tubes routinely milked, stripped, or suctioned to maintain patency? *Crit Care Nurse* 2002;22(4):70-72.

“Ask the Expert” recommends against routine tube manipulation


This randomized study compared an intervention of local application of ice to chest tube insertion site to usual care and found reduced pain with ice when coughing and during mobility exercises and less analgesic use in study patients.


Survey of practicing nurses identified significant gaps in knowledge relating to care of patients with chest tubes and makes recommendations for educational interventions.


This study, in followup to the previous, checked knowledge deficit and then examined how nurses gained knowledge as practicing professionals.


This classic study is one of the first to compare milking, stripping and no manipulation to CABG patients and determined there was no benefit to tube manipulation and recommended avoiding any dependent loops in the drainage tubing.


A study comparing two methods of ambulation: the standard practice in which IV pole, oxygen tank, Foley catheter, chest tube and drain were handled by assistive personnel OR use of a device designed to hold the equipment and incorporate a walker if needed. The integrated system was preferred by the patients and the nurses noted it was safer for ambulation compared to traditional methods. A comprehensive review of literature relating to postoperative ambulation is included.


This retrospective correlational study determined that the risk of any hospital acquired infection increased in patients with chest tubes as chest tube days rose.


This pilot study (upon which Fox relied) found patients were ill prepared for their experience with chest tubes; pain was intense but short-lasting with tube removal.

Randomized trial compared milking (any compression with twisting or squeezing) with stripping (continuous compression with a roller) when a clot was visible in the drainage tubing. 78/200 patients had no clots; tube manipulation did not improve outcomes and is not recommended.


Prospective observational study compared bedside thoracic ultrasound by APRN with portable chest radiography to detect pneumothorax in cardiothoracic surgery patients immediately after pleural chest tube removal; each method found 3 pneumothoraces with ultrasound results in 4.24 minutes and radiography results in 79.2 minutes at a cost of $200.


This animal study was designed to expand on Gordon’s research and compared tubing positions: straight, coiled, dependent loop, and loop that was lifted and drained in the setting of pleural pressure changes with breathing. Dependent loop had significantly less fluid drainage; dependent loop and lift and drain had significantly higher pressure measured in the lumen at the chest tube / drainage tube connector (-6 cmH2O) than other positions (-20 cmH2O).


Review of nursing care for patients with chest tubes: types of drains, nursing role, drain position, insertion complications, infection control, monitoring, tube manipulation, suction, pain management, and drain removal.


This literature review found no research in support of stripping or milking chest tube draining tubing to maintain patency.


This randomized trial compared use of Micropore and Transpore tape for dressings on median sternotomy beginning with the first postop dressing change by assessing irritation and stripping of skin. Irritation with Micropore was significantly lower than Transpore and skin stripping scores were also significantly worse with Transpore with Transpore worsening each POD and Micropore improving.


Randomized study comparing semiocclusive, occlusive hydrocolloid and standard absorbent dressings on median sternotomy; wounds were evaluated during 4 weeks postop. Conventional dressing more effective in wound healing, less painful to remove and more cost effective despite the need for more frequent dressing changes.


Randomized study comparing dry absorbent dressing, hydrocolloid dressing, and hydroactive dressing applied in the OR at skin closure. No differences in wound healing or rate of infection; dry absorbent was most comfortable and most cost-effective; hydrocolloid increased wound exudate and required more frequent changes due to poor integrity; more discomfort with removal and increased cost.

Retrospective descriptive study to determine drainage volume after CABG; mean duration of tube was 45.2 hours with total drainage 1300 mL with plateau of 31 mL/hr at hour 8, suggesting tubes could safely be removed earlier after surgery

**Literature Reviews by Speaker**


Note: Not all of the nursing references are cited in the presentation; this comprehensive list is designed as a resource tool to develop evidence-based policies and procedures

**Additional Annotated References**


Randomized trial that compared tube removal at 24 hours with tube removal at 48 hours as long as drainage was not >100mL in prior 8 hours; early removal improved outcomes and reduced resource use without increase in effusions


Retrospective review of trauma patients; CT measurements used to determine chest wall thickness at nipple line. Post-removal pneumothorax was diagnosed with CXR, occurring in 30% of patients. Significant risk factors were younger age, penetrating mechanism of injury, and thin chest wall; logistic regression showed only chest wall thickness as independent risk factor.


Retrospective review of lung resection patients comparing those whose chest tubes were at -20 cmH2O with those who were at gravity drainage; all patients had CXR in PACU, 72% had no air leak after surgery; tube removal criteria <200 mL/24h, no air leak. Patients with suction were converted to gravity at mean of POD 2.65. Without air leak: chest tube duration suction 4.5d, gravity 3.19d; LOS suction 6.74d, gravity 5.13d Air leak: chest tube duration suction 6.35d, gravity 5d; LOS suction 8.96d, gravity 6.57d; all differences p<0.05; there were no complications attributable to difference in chest drain management.


Comprehensive literature review that discusses imaging with CT, radiograph and ultrasound to detect pneumothorax; “occult” is considered not seen on CXR, approx 2-17% in trauma; provides algorithm, and examines the question “do all patients with pneumothorax of any size...
require a chest tube if they receive mechanical ventilation?" If fewer chest tubes, reduce 22% risk for associated complications


Increased complication rate when residents inserted tubes, but less than half of malpositioning were detected by CXR, requiring CT to detect these


Compared a new protocol of single postop chest tube; suction -10 cmH2O until pneumothorax <25% or absent, then to gravity drainage; removed when air leak resolved and drainage <400mL/day. When compared with usual care of multiple tubes and suction, there was statistically significant shorter duration of air leak and chest tube and decreased LOS without increase in morbidity or mortality


Randomized trial that compared tube removal based on digital measurements of air leak: if zero for at least past 6 hours, CXR -> tube removed OR instantaneous observation for bubbling: if no bubbling, CXR -> tube removed. Digital measurement resulted in fewer chest tube days, LOS and reduced costs overall.


Randomized trial that compared gravity drainage OR gravity drainage during the day with suction applied at night in patients with visible air leak the morning after surgery; -10 cmH2O applied until morning after surgery, same level at night in suction group. Night suction group had less prolonged air leak, less chest tube time and shorter LOS.


Retrospective study over 10 years with 8608 procedures discovered chest tubes could be removed with drainage < 450mL/day without risk of recurrent effusion


Systematic review and meta-analysis comparing suction with water seal found no difference in duration of air leak, duration of chest tubes, or LOS; suction associated with reduced incidence of pneumothorax, but clinical significance is not known


“Best evidence review” examined the literature and only considered Issacson, Lim-Levy and Pierce to meet inclusion criteria; insufficient evidence to support tube manipulation; given risks illustrated by Duncan, tube manipulation is not recommended


Randomized trial compared milking (1 min Q 2 hr x 48 hr) with observation and all patients had -20 cmH2O. Milking significantly increased drainage, but thought to be resulting from stimulation of pleura, not because tube was more patent; no clots were observed in tubes of any patients; advise against routine tube manipulation

This systematic review and meta-analysis examined RCT comparing suction with gravity drainage. Suction reduces postoperative pneumothorax (but not clinically significant), no difference on length of air leak, data favored reduced chest tube time and length of stay in gravity group, but studies not standardized enough for meta-analysis on this point.


Prospective study that examined 400 cardiac surgery patients’ CXR after pleural tube removal found residual asymptomatic inconsequential pneumothorax in 9.3% of patients; 2 patients whose pneumothorax required reinsertion of chest tube were symptomatic. No indication for routine films without specific clinical changes.


Patients hospitalized with pneumothorax and chest drainage and not on mechanical ventilation had CXR and ultrasound 24 hours after bubbling in the drain ceased, 6 hr after clamping, and 6 hr after tube removal. All residual pneumothorax seen on CXR were also seen on ultrasound; 13 (39%) pneumothorax seen on ultrasound were missed and confirmed with either CT scan or aspirating air through the pleural catheter. Time to obtain ultrasound results was 35 min (mean) for CXR, 71 min.


Compared tube removal when appearance of drainage turned to serosanguineous with removal when < 50 mL x 5 hr; no difference in post removal pericardial effusion; safe to remove tubes when appearance changes because it indicates cessation of active bleeding


Single chest tube after VATS to gravity drainage, removed when drainage < 400 mL/24 hr; 59% removed within 24 hr and 83% within 48 hr without increase in complications


Whenever a postoperative CXR was ordered, ultrasound was performed to compare results. Mean CXR to results was 166 min, ultrasound 11 min; compared with CXR, ultrasound had sensitivity of 83% and specificity of 59%; for pneumothorax, sensitivity of 21% and specificity of 95%. May be able to reduce number of CXR, but not replace.


Letter in response to Cerfolio 2008


Chest trauma patients randomized for tube removal when drainage 150 mL/day (standard) or 200 mL/day (trial); trial patients had shorter LOS despite no significant difference in tube duration


Letter in response to Gottgens 2011


Nurses removed chest tubes when drainage < 20 mL/2hr and no air leak. 98% of CXR showed no pneumothorax; in 2 patients, clinical changes would have required CXR. Routine CXR not indicated after chest tube removal.

Comprehensive review of the literature and current state of practice regarding thoracic catheters in pleural conditions. Covers tube type; insertion techniques; size and configuration; comparing size for various clinical indications including pneumothorax, pleural effusion, hemothorax, and postoperative treatment.


Patients who had routine CXR after chest tube removal (usual) were compared with those who only had CXR if symptomatic after tube removal. 8/703 routine patients had chest tubes replaced for symptomatic pleural effusion or pneumothorax; 14/297 in the study group had CXR for symptoms; three were completely normal, and 2 required chest tubes. 283 had no symptoms and no CXR.


Observational multicenter study identified 588 occult pneumothorax in blunt trauma patients. 79% were observed; of these, 6% required chest tube for clinical deterioration; most patients in group who died died from TBI. Most blunt trauma patients with occult pneumothorax can be carefully monitored without chest tube.


285 knots of 4 types of suture material were split into two groups; half were exposed to petroleum for 12 hr, the others exposed to saline. Tensile strength was then tested to assess knot failure; knots exposed to petroleum failed at a lower tensile strength, many by untying.


Compared patients with -10 cmH2O suction with those on gravity drainage. Tube removal when no air leak and < 200mL/24 h. No hazards with gravity drainage, but not able to statistically power duration of air leak or chest tube; did note statistically significant increase in fluid drainage in suction patients.


Animal study that compared ultrasound with CT scan in detecting pneumothorax during positive pressure ventilation; 10 different volumes were assessed. Accuracy in detecting pneumothorax was comparable with ultrasound and CT.


Randomized trial compared suction -15 to – 20 cmH2O to gravity drainage; there was no statistically significant difference in any measure between the groups, including time of chest tube, persistent air leak, complications, or hospital LOS. Raises the question whether “pneumothorax” on CXR is actually dead space or the result of atelectasis from sputum retention, in which case suction will not resolve the condition. Suction is not necessary after lobectomy, may contribute to maintenance of air leak.


“Best evidence review” examined the literature finding 6 studies that met review criteria; no studies in favor of suction, 2 found no difference, and 4 favored gravity; 5 of the 6 initially used suction for a “short period”

“Best evidence review” examined the literature finding 6 studies that met review criteria; conclusion is that routine CXR after tube removal offers no diagnostic or therapeutic advantage over those performed when there is a clinical indication with a change in patient assessment; this is the determining factor for replacing tubes in patients with positive findings on routine CXR


Survey of North American cardiothoracic surgeons and nurses to identify problems with chest tube management; tube clogging was the leading concern; surgeons tend to choose larger tubes to reduce this risk; 74% of surgeons allow stripping, 23% discourage it and 4% forbid it; 28% of nurses’ facilities allow stripping, while 72% do not allow; 75% of nurses agreed that managing chest tube clogging took them away from other important tasks.


This evidence review was done after earlier research by the author that discovered wide variations in care that were not based on research. Addresses indications; tube insertion; complications; management: avoid dependent loops, clamp only to change drain or assess tolerance of tube removal, most patients do well with gravity, but suction may be used if lung is not re-expanded; assessment should include volume and nature of fluid drainage, bubbling in water seal relative to respiratory cycle or coughing, radiograph for tube position and lung expansion, seek specialist if air leak >2 d, check for alternative source of air leak, subcutaneous air; remove when air leak zero x24 hr, fluid < 200mL and lung expanded


Retrospective review of routine CXR findings in infants after chest tube removal; no chest tubes were reinserted in asymptomatic infants regardless of CXR findings, tubes were reinserted in 5 of 12 infants (one with reaccumulation of pleural effusion, 4 for air) with respiratory distress; 7 of 12 had no abnormalities on CXR. Routine CXR is not recommended.


Cochrane Review found 3 studies that met criteria but could not be combined in meta-analysis; no data to support tube manipulation (milking or stripping) to prevent cardiac tamponade; no evidence to support or reject tube manipulation


Prospective study compared patient management in patients who had routine CXR with those who did not, both postoperatively and post tube removal. Management changed in 3 patients based on postop CXR; intervention in 1 patient post tube removal was based on clinical presentation, not CXR; there were no adverse events in those who did not have routine CXR.


Review of the literature and state of the art in assessing for and managing pneumothorax in critically ill patients. CT is the gold standard, but may be impractical; pneumothorax can be missed on portable CXR; ultrasound is emerging as standard of care and can detect >90% of pneumothorax missed by CXR; wide range of “occult” pneumothorax: those missed on CXR and detected on CT.

Randomized study assigned patients with pleural tubes to removal when no air leak and fluid ≤ 100 mL/d, ≤ 150 mL/d ≤ 200 mL/d; drainage time and LOS not significantly different among groups; no significant differences in thoracentesis for reaccumulation of fluid. All patients -20 cmH2O suction.
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