Working Memory Capacity and Surgical Performance While Exposed to Mild Hypoxic Hypoxemia

Paul J. Parker; Andrew J. Manley; Ross Shand; John P. O'Hara; Adrian Mellor

INTRODUCTION: Medical Emergency Response Team (MERT) helicopters fly at altitudes of 3000 m in Afghanistan (9843 ft). Civilian hospitals and disaster-relief surgical teams may have to operate at such altitudes or even higher. Mild hypoxia has been seen to affect the performance of novel tasks at flight levels as low as 5000 ft. Aeromedical teams frequently work in unpressurized environments; it is important to understand the implications of this mild hypoxia and investigate whether supplementary oxygen systems are required for some or all of the team members.

METHODS: Ten UK orthopedic surgeons were recruited and in a double blind randomized experimental protocol, were acutely exposed for 45 min to normobaric hypoxia [fraction of inspired oxygen ($F_{I}O_2$) ~14.1%, equivalent to 3000 m (10,000 ft)] or normobaric normoxia (sea-level). Basic physiological parameters were recorded. Subjects completed validated tests of verbal working memory capacity (VWMC) and also applied an orthopedic external fixator (Hoffmann® 3, Stryker, UK) to a plastic tibia under test conditions.

RESULTS: Significant hypoxia was induced with the reduction of $F_{I}O_2$ to ~14.1% ($S_{p}O_2$ 87% vs. 98%). No effect of hypoxia on VWMC was observed. The pin-divergence score (a measure of frame asymmetry) was significantly greater in hypoxic conditions (4.6 mm) compared to sea level (3.0 mm); there was no significant difference in the penetrance depth (16.9 vs. 17.2 mm). One hypoxic frame would have failed early.

DISCUSSION: We believe that surgery at an altitude of 3000 m, when unacclimated individuals are acutely exposed to atmospheric hypoxia for 45 min, can likely take place without supplemental oxygen use but further work is required.

KEYWORDS: in-flight surgery, resuscitation, altitude, external fixation.

Parker PJ, Manley AJ, Shand R, O'Hara JP, Mellor A. *Working memory capacity and surgical performance while exposed to mild hypoxic hypoxemia.* Aerosp Med Hum Perform. 2017; 88(10):918–923.

Medical Emergency Response Team (MERT) helicopters fly at altitudes of 3,000 m (9843 ft) in Afghanistan and Iraq. Civilian hospitals and disaster-relief surgical teams may have to operate at such altitudes or even higher. An example is Leh Ladakh Hospital in India, situated at 11,400 ft, which was the scene of a major humanitarian disaster after flash-flooding in 2010. Furthermore, Military Surgical Resuscitation Teams (SRT) may operate in-flight at 10,000 ft or higher in nonpressurized aircraft such as the CV-22 Osprey Tilt-Rotor Aircraft. Should decompression occur in flight, or pressurization be unavailable, it is currently unclear as to whether the surgical team would benefit from supplemental oxygen by mask or other supportive measures.

Hypoxic impairment has been demonstrated at relatively low altitudes; increases in reaction time have been seen at 7000 ft,[14] in spatial awareness testing at 8000 ft,[7] arithmetic and decision-making errors at 12,000 ft,[18]and working memory at 14,000 ft.[9] The normal cabin pressure at a flight level (FL) of 28,000 ft in most military aircraft is 5000 ft. Although preservation of simpler task completion seems to be maintained at FL altitudes, higher level decision-making (e.g., adapting to unforeseen circumstances under extreme time pressure), 3D and color vision may be affected at this lower altitude,[4] particularly if hypoxia impairs aspects of cognitive functioning such as working memory capacity.

From the Defence Medical Services Hypoxic Working Group, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, UK.

This manuscript was received for review in September 2016. It was accepted for publication in July 2017.

Address correspondence to: Paul J. Parker, MB FRCSEd(Orth), Orthopaedic Department, Queen Elizabeth Hospital Birmingham, Mindelsohn Way, Birmingham B15 2TH, UK; parker_paul@hotmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3357/AMHP.4761.2017

Working memory (WM) can be defined as a system of cognitive mechanisms that facilitate the completion of various tasks through their capacity for storing, retaining, and processing information.[1,2] More specifically, working memory capacity (WMC) relates to the attentional processing component (i.e., central executive) of Baddeley and Hitch's [2] model of working memory. According to controlled attention theory,[10] WMC represents a person's ability to regulate and direct attention, which is particularly important when completing tasks that are novel in some way, or need to be performed in contexts where interference or distractions are prevalent. Recent evidence from high-performance sport contexts[11,17] suggests that WMC is a good predictor of how an athlete will perform under pressure (e.g., unfamiliar situations, distracting thoughts), with high WMC associated with greater success when attempting to block out task-irrelevant information. Although WMC is now a widely-studied topic within psychological science,[1] it has received little attention within domains such as medicine and surgical skill.

Given that mild hypoxia has been seen to affect the performance of novel tasks (improved after practice) at levels as low as 5000 ft,[7] the purpose of this study was to examine whether there was deterioration in physiological parameters, surgical skill, and WMC when exposed to short, 45-min periods of normobaric hypoxic hypoxemia (3000 m or ~10,000 ft). There are a small number of studies which suggest that normobaric hypoxia is less of a physiological stress compared with hypobaric hypoxia,[6] even though the partial pressure of oxygen is the principal physiological stimulus to high altitude adaptation.[16] However, these data are potentially confounded, particularly by small samples sizes,[6] making it difficult to form a consensus. Therefore, simulating high altitude through the use of normobaric hypoxic in a controlled environment was deemed appropriate for this pilot study before taking the research into the field. This pilot study aimed to develop a model to test the effect of hypoxia on cognition and motor skills relevant to a surgical team. This would then inform whether supplemental oxygen or other novel solutions were required for unacclimated teams performing emergency surgery at altitude, either in an aircraft or if deployed rapidly to moderate altitudes.

METHODS

Subjects

Ten UK orthopedic surgeons were recruited to take part in this study. They were all consultants or trainees working in the Northeast of England. Seven were men and three were women. The experimental procedures were fully explained to each participant before the study, and all subjects provided written informed consent. The protocol used during the investigation had received full institutional ethical approval from the Ethics Committee of Leeds Beckett University.

Each subject completed an initial health-screening questionnaire and underwent a basic medical examination. Exclusion criteria included pregnancy, active asthma, chronic obstructive airways disease, hypertension, past history of stroke, myocardial infarction, angina, diabetes and peripheral vascular disease. All female subjects were offered a pregnancy test, as hypoxic exposure may potentially be harmful to a fetus.[12] Further, all subjects were nonsmokers. Due to the nature of the adopted cognitive functioning test, subjects with dyslexia/dyspraxia were also excluded from the study. Only normal healthy volunteers were then allowed to enter the normobaric hypoxic chamber. All subjects were required to abstain from caffeine and alcohol for the 24 h prior to the trial.

Experimental Design

In a double blind, repeated measures randomized control trial, subjects were acutely exposed for 45 min to normobaric hypoxia (fraction of inspired oxygen (F_IO_2) of ~14.1% [considering water vapor pressure,[3] equivalent to 3000 m (~10,000 ft), P_iO_2 100 mmHg]) or near sea level [absolute altitude ~113 m (Leeds Beckett University, Centre for Sports Performance, Leeds, UK)] under normobaric normoxia (F_IO_2 of 20.9%) in an environmental chamber (TISS, Alton, UK and Sporting Edge, Sherfield on Loddon, UK).

However, only the lead researcher on each given testing day knew the environmental conditions, but their only interaction was the assessment of the physiological parameters. They kept the oxygen saturation recordings confidential from the other experimenters in the chamber who were assessing the verbal working memory capacity (VWMC) and surgical skills, to ensure the best possible blinding of the protocol. As regards the ambient breathing for the sea level condition, this was achieved by the system providing fresh air to the chamber at a high flow rate, drawn in by a compressor from the external environment. In contrast, during the altitude condition the hypoxic system filtered out oxygen from external ambient air, then supplied air with a reduced fraction of oxygen to the chamber. This was then mixed with ambient air once the set point was met, to maintain the hypoxic air within 0.15% of the required F_IO_2.

Both tests were performed on the same day, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, with a minimum of a 2-h wash-out time between them. Subjects were unaware of the F_IO_2 being inhaled, in that the control unit for the chamber was concealed from the subjects and the mechanical operating noise of the chamber was not dependent on its working F_IO_2.

Before entering the chamber, ten subjects completed baseline tests of VWMC. Subsequently baseline physiological parameters—heart rate, blood pressure, oxygen saturation (S_pO_2)—were measured. Subjects then entered the chamber and rested for 15 min, simulating rescue flight time for casualty retrieval. This also allowed for internal physiological equilibration. After this "simulation period," subjects completed the test of VWMC for a second time, with further repeat measurement of baseline data. These physiological measurements were completed at 15 min from the start of the VWMC test. In the event of any subject feeling unwell, having an oxygen saturation of less than 75%, or heart rate of greater than 170 bpm, they would have been removed from the chamber. This was never necessary.

Ten subjects were then asked to apply an orthopedic external fixator (Hoffmann® 3, Stryker, UK) to a dry plastic tibia by hand-drilling four threaded pins into the bone and connecting them together with carbon-fiber bars. This application was assessed by an observer blinded with regard to time taken and accuracy, alignment, efficacy and success of construct. Subjects were allowed a maximum of 15 min for this task. Ten subjects then repeated the VWMC test and were subjected to physiological measures for a third and final time 15 min after leaving the chamber. The chamber condition was then reset before the experiment was repeated at the alternate chamber parameter (e.g., sea-level to hypoxic).

Procedures

Subjects completed validated tests of VWMC, using an Operational Span protocol adapted from Conway et al.[5] Tasks including mental calculations, reasoning, planning, and complex decision-making rely on WMC.[8,15,17] For surgical teams to perform optimally, VWMC is important to allow for: a) effective verbal communication; and b) accurate response to verbal information, especially under time pressure and in the face of multiple potential distractions. For example, in an emergency medical procedure, an MERT member would often be required to attend to and process multiple sources of verbal information such as instructions from other colleagues within the team. Simultaneously, the MERT member would also need to hold other information in mind to inform the completion of tasks such as calculating, preparing, and administering appropriate doses of anesthetics. With this example in mind, a test of VWMC was deemed an appropriate measure of cognitive function within this study, as it would closely replicate a number of cognitive challenges commonly faced by MERT surgeons at altitude.

The test (which takes between 4 and 10 min) consisted of eight separate trials, with each trial including a series of between two and five standardized mathematical problems. Trials were presented to subjects via a laptop (Toshiba Tecra A50-A-151, Neuss, Germany) using Microsoft PowerPoint®. Within each trial, subjects were required to read aloud each mathematical problem, and state whether the answer provided was correct or incorrect, before reading an unrelated word aloud. Therefore, an example of a single problem and correct response would appear as follows:

> Example problem presented to participant: Is $(6 \times 2) - 5 = 7$? Class.
> Example correct response: "*Is six times two minus five equal to seven…yes…class.*"

The mathematical problem was the "interference" task necessary to obtain a measure of VWMC. In combination, the mathematical problem and recall of unrelated words represents a task sufficiently complex to test VWMC as well as inhibition (referred to as "selective attention"), another executive function closely associated with, yet distinct from WM.[8] The principal measure of VWMC was the number of unrelated words that subjects were able to accurately recall in sequence order at the end of each trial. However, the number of mathematical problems accurately completed by subjects was also recorded as a manipulation check. Provided subjects responded correctly to 80% of the posed mathematical problems, their VWMC data could be included within the analysis. All subjects met this criterion, which indicated that subjects were expending sufficient levels of cognitive effort on both tasks simultaneously, ensuring that the total number of words recalled in correct sequence was sufficient as a reliable measure of VWMC.[5] VWMC test performance was assessed using the Partial-Credit Unit (PCU) scoring method, as advocated by Conway et al.[5] PCU expresses the proportion of elements that are recalled correctly in the order they were originally presented. Applying the PCU method, the following would apply for the accurate recall of three unrelated words:

> Order of words presented within a single trial: Table, Look, Melt.
> Full Recall (all words recalled in order = score of 3/3): "*Table*, *Look*, *Melt*".
> Partial Recall (one word recalled in correct order = score of 1/3): "*Look*, *Table*, *Melt*".

The PCU method was favored over All-or-Nothing scoring (i.e., where no credit is awarded for partially accurate recall within a single trial) because it follows established procedures from the development and application of psychometrics.[5] Given the novelty of this test, subjects were provided with instructions and a practice trial before every test of VWMC that was conducted.

Heart rate was obtained from a heart rate monitor (Polar RS400, Polar, Electro Oy, Finland). Blood pressure was measured using an automated blood pressure cuff M6 (Omron Healthcare, Milton Keynes, UK) with the participant sitting upright at rest. Resting recordings of oxygen saturation (S_pO_2) were performed using a Nellcor N-20P pulse oximeter (Nellcor Puritan Bennett, Coventry, UK). According to the manufacturer's specifications, this device can operate at altitudes up to 6200 m and S_pO_2 within the range of 70–100% is accurate to $\pm$ 2%, when compared to arterial samples.

Extremity trauma and ballistic limb injuries are the wounds most often seen in military trauma. Such wounds require debridement and skeletal stabilization. Debridement adequacy, arterial, intestinal or vein repair were all considered as test skills but all authors agreed that these would be almost impossible to reproducibly test or score. Therefore, the application of an external fixator was chosen even though no standardized tests or scoring systems exist for measuring its accuracy or efficacy. That having been stated, the external fixator frame should, however, be applied as symmetrically as possible: If the pins converge too much (or even touch) on the far side of the bone, they will exhibit reduced purchase and stress-risers can even cause a fracture. If the frame is overly asymmetric, it will be biomechanically disadvantaged. It is possible, however, to assess and compare pin penetration: in clinical practice, the pins should normally just millimetrically penetrate the far bone cortex to avoid deep tissue, nerve or vascular damage. For pin penetration, this was measured and summated for all four pins per fixator. Higher scores being perceived as worse, a 5,6,3,5 mm penetration thus produces an overall penetration score of 19 mm. Pin penetration data were unfortunately not recorded on the first test run. The time taken to fully apply the fixator was also recorded.

Pin alignment can also be measured (**Fig. 1**): for biomechanical reasons, all pins should be parallel to each other. Although it would have been technically possible to directly measure the angular difference between pins, this could have led to parallax-based intraobserver error. The authors felt that a more accurate way to measure angular change was to measure the successive horizontal differences in spacing between the pins (or pin-hole centers) as they passed through the near and far cortices of the studied bone. Between four pins, this then produces three near and three far millimetric linear values. These values can then be compared: e.g., a score of 55,70,55 mm (near) and 55,70,55 mm (far) produces a 'difference or asymmetry score' of zero.

To explain this further, a 'near' figure of 55 mm means that the distance between the first and second inserted pins is 55 mm on the bone surface closest to the skin. The figure of 55 mm on the 'far' surface demonstrates that this separation is absolutely maintained on the bone surface farthest away from the skin. These pins are parallel – which is best biomechanically. Four parallel pins with successively equally spaced entrance and exit holes, therefore, produce an overall difference score of zero. Conversely, if the distance between two successive pins was 55 mm near and 60 mm far, this would indicate that these pins were skewed by 5 mm. Therefore, an asymmetry score of 85,70,80 mm (near) and 88,70,88 mm (far) produces a score of 11, indicating skewed pins (diverging or converging) with over a centimeter difference in spacing between the entrance and exit holes. The higher the score, the worse the asymmetry. Skewed pins make frame construction more difficult and negatively alter the strength and biomechanics of the fixator construct.

Statistical Analysis

All data were approximately normally distributed (Shapiro, Wilk) and are presented as mean ± SD. Statistical analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS version 22 for the physiological and psychological data and Graphpad2 for the external fixator data. A 0.95 level of confidence was predetermined to denote statistical significance ($P < 0.05$).



Fig. 1. External fixator showing pin alignment: The second pin from right is not contained within the clamp. Only one pin is holding this side of the fracture. The far right pin is also asymmetrically placed.

VWMC was analyzed using a Two-Way (Altitude (2 conditions; hypoxia and normoxia) x Time (3 time points)) Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). It is important to note that prior to final data analysis, one of the subjects disclosed that they found the test of VWMC difficult, possibly due to being dyslexic. Based on this information, it was decided not to include this participant's data within the final analysis.

One-way ANOVA was used to compare differences in the physiological variables. Where significance was detected, post hoc analysis was performed using a paired *t*-test with Bonferroni adjustment (alpha level of 0.05 per test (0.05/10). There were five measurement points [baseline normoxia (T1), 15 min into the normoxic exposure (T2), 15 min post-normoxic exposure (T3), 15 min into the hypoxic exposure (T4), and 15 min post-hypoxic exposure (T5)] for the physiological variables, making ten paired comparisons (T1 vs. T2, T1 vs. T3, T1 vs T4, T1 vs. T5, T2 vs. T3, T2 vs. T4, T2 vs. T5, T3 vs. T4, T3 vs. T5 and T4 vs. T5), so the alpha level was adjusted accordingly to detect significance. A 2-tailed *t*-test was used to analyze the external fixator data.

RESULTS

Time taken to apply the fixator was 272.22 s in the hypoxic environment and 293.87 s at sea-level (paired *t*-test, $P = 0.26$, NS). **Table I** shows that the divergence score was significantly greater in hypoxia (paired *t*-test, $P = 0.04$) compared to sea level. **Table II** shows that there was no significant difference in the penetration depth between conditions (paired *t*-test, $P = 0.88$). One pin was not placed within the clamp. Repeated Measures ANOVA did not reveal significant main effects of VWMC as a function of altitude condition ($df = 1$, $F = 0.046$, $P = 0.836$) or time point ($df = 2$, $F = 1.624$, $P = 0.229$). See **Table III** for Mean scores and SDs.

There were no significant differences in systolic ($df = 4$, $F = 0.363$, $P = 0.883$) and diastolic ($df = 4$, $F = 0.827$, $P = 0.518$) blood pressure between time points, as was the case for heart rate ($df = 4$, $F = 0.835$, $P = 0.513$, **Table IV**). Further, there

Table I. Divergence Scores (mm) Under Hypoxic and Sea-Level Conditions.

	DIVERGENCE (mm)	
	HYPOXIC ($N = 10$)	SEA-LEVEL ($N = 10$)
	4	0
	11	6
	2	4
	3	1
	5	3
	3	2
	4	4
	6	3
	3	3
	5	4
M	4.60*	3.00*
SD	2.55	1.70
SEM	0.81	0.54

* Significantly different ($P < 0.05$).

Table II. Pin Penetration Scores (mm) Under Hypoxic and Sea-Level Conditions.

	PIN PENETRATION (MM)	
	HYPOXIC (*N* = 9)	SEA-LEVEL (*N* = 9)
	13	19
	20	23
	7	10
	18	21
	13	13
	21	16
	17	20
	20	20
	23	13
M	16.90	17.20
SD	5.04	4.41
SEM	1.68	1.47

were no significant differences in S_pO_2 over time when measurements were taken during normoxia (paired *t*-test, $P = 0.081$). However, S_pO_2 was significantly lower (paired *t*-test, $P < 0.001$) following 15 min of hypoxic exposure compared to any other measurement time point in normoxia.

DISCUSSION

Our study was designed to answer two questions: a) In an unpressurised environment, would surgical teams benefit from supplemental oxygen or other supportive measures? and b) If delivered to altitude to perform humanitarian assistance, should surgical teams need to wait (i.e., acclimatize) before performing complex tasks? The answer to both questions, based on the results of our pilot study, would appear to be not significantly.

Our subjects performed cognitive and surgical tasks under normobaric hypoxia (F_IO_2 ~14.1%) over a 45-min period. Analysis of external fixation performance showed that although all frames would have worked (i.e., acutely stabilized a fracture), an aggregate measure of asymmetry in the pin's placement was greater in the hypoxic condition. Parallel pins are biomechanically better. Pin penetration was not significantly different. However, in one hypoxic application, one fixator pin was not placed in its fixator clamp. This therefore connected only one pin to the frame on that side of the fracture and its fixation (bone-hold) would likely have failed early when stressed. However, on expected handover to the next link in the casualty evacuation chain, this would normally be immediately remedied. External fixator application, like many orthopedic techniques, requires 3D visualization of a number of reference points in space, central processing of these points and then by using fine and gross motor skills, rapidly and accurately placing a pin through both cortices of the relevant bone.

Performance would not have been influenced by acute mountain sickness, as signs and symptoms typically take more than 4 h to develop and our subjects were only exposed to moderate altitude for up to 45 min. The altitude being simulated, 3000 m (~10,000 ft), is not an excessive altitude and although not encountered routinely within the UK, is common at the top peaks of European and North American Ski Resorts (e.g., Steamboat Springs, CO, 11,000 ft; Val Thorens Village, France 2300 m, highest lift 3200 m). In all our subjects, despite significant decreases in S_pO_2, no significant effects of hypoxia on heart rate, systolic and diastolic blood pressure were observed.

Our data showed no effect of altitude on VWMC, indicating that impairment of this particular measure of cognitive function is unlikely to occur for surgeons performing at altitudes of 3000 m (~10,000 ft) during a 45-min period of acute hypoxic exposure. Although such findings are encouraging for initiatives related to the deployment of mobile surgical teams, it is important to consider the following implications regarding the experimental design and methods adopted in follow-up work. First, it is important that future studies include more extensive baseline/familiarization periods in relation to tests of cognitive function (e.g., VWMC) and surgical skill. Second, it would be useful for subsequent work to employ and develop assessments of cognitive function (e.g., Stroop Tests for measuring Inhibition/Interference Control, Spatial Span Tests, Reasoning Tasks) that also reflect the context-specific demands placed on surgical teams.

Clearly, teams that have time to acclimate at altitude (e.g., those that live and work continuously at altitude in mountainous areas such as Kashmir or Nepal) should not theoretically have the same problems as unacclimated teams. However, acclimatization is complex, involving various bodily systems, all of which adapt to altitude across different time periods ranging from days to weeks. Acclimatization is not always possible, particularly as military air bases are usually situated (if possible) closer to sea level as the thicker air aids heavier take-off loads. There then often follows a rapid ascent to altitude, which is what we sought to simulate in our testing. Yet, even though S_pO_2 was lower with acute hypoxic exposure, hypoxemia did not influence VWMC or fixator task performance during a short 45-min exposure period. Whether surgical skills and/or cognitive functioning are affected during longer exposures to altitude is yet to be established, and should be a focus for future research.

It is clear from aviation research that immediate exposure to altitudes higher than 10,000 ft can produce profound and disabling, life-threatening hypoxemia. Such nonexplosive decompression might occur in compressor failure or the requirement to operate with 'doors-open' such as in a CV-22 Osprey or a CH-47 Chinook airframe. Exposure to this profound hypoxemia was not our aim and we could not envisage any real-world

Table III. VWMC Performance of Subjects (*N* = 9) in Normoxia and Hypoxia.

	BASELINE NORMOXIA	15 MIN NORMOXIA	15 MIN POST NORMOXIA	15 MIN HYPOXIA	15 MIN POST HYPOXIA*
Number of words recalled	16 ± 3	19 ± 8	17 ± 6	19 ± 5	18 ± 4

* This score was recorded in normoxia. Note: The maximum VWMC score was 28 in all conditions.

Table IV. Physiological Parameters.

	BASELINE NORMOXIA	15 MIN NORMOXIA	15 MIN POST NORMOXIA	15 MIN HYPOXIA	15 MIN POST HYPOXIA*
Heart Rate (bpm)	68 ± 13	71 ± 10	69 ± 15	74 ± 14	70 ± 14
S_pO_2 (%)	98 ± 1	98 ± 1	98 ± 1	87 ± 4**	97 ± 3
Blood Pressure (mmHg)					
Systolic	124 ± 11	123 ± 12	122 ± 11	125 ± 11	124 ± 10
Diastolic	77 ± 9	78 ± 10	76 ± 9	74 ± 6	78 ± 8

* This measurement was made in normoxia. **Significantly lower than all other time points ($P < 0.001$).

scenario where our teams would be required to operate under these conditions. If an aircraft decompressed at this altitude, it would immediately descend to 5000 ft and proceed to the nearest airfield.

We accept the following potential confounders in our research: Individual performance within the study may have been influenced by prior medical experience and familiarity with the Hoffman 3 fixator. However, in using the subjects as their own controls in normoxia, we believe the potential impact of any learning effect was minimized. The number of subjects was small, and we did not test the full range of skills that may be impeded at altitude, meaning that definitive conclusions cannot be made at this stage. There are many other aspects of providing medical care in flight which may be affected under hypoxic conditions as well as situations which may potentiate any hypoxia such as exercise and stress, posture (e.g., crouched anesthetists), environmental variables (e.g., heat, noise) on individual and team performance at altitude. Furthermore, this study used normobaric hypoxia, which may provide a different physiological stress compared to hypobaric hypoxia. These considerations should direct future research. Specifically, researchers are urged to include extended periods of atmospheric-variable exposure within subsequent studies of this nature. In addition, it is important that researchers make greater efforts to incorporate a range of cognitive tests that are informed by and accurately reflect established models and theories of cognitive functioning,[1,2] attentional control[10] and decision-making.[13] In conclusion: Surgery at an altitude of 3000 m (~10,000 ft), when unacclimated individuals are acutely exposed to atmospheric hypoxia for 45 min, can likely safely take place without supplemental oxygen use. We observed changes in fine motor surgical skills under simulated conditions but further larger studies are required. Our future research will assess if more safeguards are required at higher altitudes or stressful environmental conditions to prevent performance deterioration in surgical teams.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Alex Griffiths, Ashley Grindrod, Cameron Bains, Lisa Whitaker, Mark Cooke, Mohammed Javed, and Paul Leonard for their assistance with data collection. They would also like to thank Stuart Latimer from Stryker (UK) for provision of the Hoffmann 3 External Fixator system used. We would also like to thank the Medical Director of the UK Surgeon-General's Department for the generous grant which made this research possible.

Authors and affiliations: Paul J. Parker, FIMC FRCSEd(Orth), and Adrian Mellor, M.D., FRCA, Defence Medical Services Hypoxic Study Group; and Andrew J. Manley, Ph.D., Ross Shand, M.Sc., C. Psychol., and John P. O'Hara, Ph.D., Institute for Sport, Physical Activity & Leisure, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, UK.

REFERENCES

1. Baddeley AD. Working memory, thought, and action. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2007.
2. Baddeley AD, Hitch GJ. Working memory. In: Bower GH, editor. The psychology of learning and motivation: advances in research and theory, vol. 8. New York (NY): Academic Press; 1974:47–89.
3. Conkin J. PH20 and simulated hypobaric hypoxia. Aviat Space Environ Med. 2011; 82(12):1157–1158.
4. Connolly DM, Barbur JL, Hosking SL, Moorhead IR. Mild hypoxia impairs chromatic sensitivity in the mesopic range. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2008; 49(2):820–827.
5. Conway ARA, Kane MJ, Bunting MF, Hambrick DZ, Wilhelm O, Engle RW. Working memory span tasks: a methodological review and user's guide. Psychon Bull Rev. 2005; 12(5):769–786.
6. Coppel J, Hennis P, Gilbert-Kawai E, Grocott MPW. The physiological effects of hypobaric hypoxia versus normobaric hypoxia: a systematic review of crossover trials. Extrem Physiol Med. 2015; 4:2.
7. Denison DM, Ledwith F, Poulton EC. Complex reaction times at simulated cabin altitudes of 5,000 feet and 8,000 feet. Aerosp Med. 1966; 37(10):1010–1013.
8. Diamond A. Executive functions. Annu Rev Psychol. 2013; 64:135–168.
9. Du JY, Li XY, Zhuang Y, Wu XY, Wang T. Effects of acute mild and moderate hypoxia on human short memory. Space Med Med Eng (Beijing). 1999; 12(4):270–273.
10. Engle RW. Working memory capacity as executive attention. Curr Dir Psychol Sci. 2002; 11:19–23.
11. Furley PA, Memmert D. Working memory capacity as controlled attention in tactical decision making. J Sport Exerc Psychol. 2012; 34:322–344.
12. Golan H, Kashtuzki I, Hallak M, Sorokin Y, Huleihel M. Maternal hypoxia during pregnancy induces fetal neurodevelopmental brain damage: partial protection by magnesium sulfate. J Neurosci Res. 2004; 78(3):430–441.
13. Kahneman D. Thinking, fast and slow. London, UK: Penguin Books; 2011.
14. McCarthy D, Corban R, Legg S, Faris J. Effects of mild hypoxia on perceptual-motor performance: a signal-detection approach. Ergonomics. 1995; 38(10):1979–1992.
15. Patel VL, Kaufman DR, Arocha JF. Emerging paradigms of cognition in medical decision-making. J Biomed Inform. 2002; 35:52–75.
16. Self DA, Mandella JG, Prinzo OV, Forster EM, Shaffstall RM. Physiological equivalence of normobaric and hypobaric exposures of humans to 25,000 feet (7620 m). Aviat Space Environ Med. 2011; 82:97–103.
17. Wood G, Vine SJ, Wilson MR. Working memory capacity, controlled attention and aiming performance under pressure. Psychol Res. 2016; 80:510–517.
18. Wu X, Li X, Han L, Wang T, Wei Y. Effects of acute moderate hypoxia on human performance of arithmetic. Space Med Med Eng (Beijing). 1998; 11(6):391–395.