

Analysis of Optimal Perioperative Sedation Methods in Paediatric Anaesthesia: A Prospective Randomized Study

Milan Modi¹, Nilam Dalal², Snigdha Kumari³, Swati Nuna Jain^{4*}

¹M.S (Orthopaedic), Department of Orthopaedics, Banas Medical College & Research Centre, Palanpur, Gujarat, India

²D.A (Anaesthesia), Department of Anaesthesia, Banas Medical College & Research Centre, Palanpur, Gujarat, India

³Senior Resident, Departmental of Anaesthesiology and Critical care, AIIMS Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India
⁴M.D (Anaesthesia), Consultant Anaesthetist, Gujarat, India

Received: 05-01-2024 / Revised: 20-01-2024 / Accepted: 30-01-2024

Corresponding Author: Dr Swati Nuna Jain

Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract:

Background and Objectives: Addressing the distinctive challenges of paediatric anaesthesia requires a careful consideration of perioperative sedation strategies to ensure both safety and patient comfort. This study delves into the refinement of these strategies in a cohort of 345 paediatric patients (ages 2-12) undergoing elective surgery.

Methods: The investigation involved a comparative analysis of three sedation approaches: Group S (standard sedation), Group T (titrated sedation), and Group M (minimal sedation). The patients underwent randomization, and their status was continuously monitored for adverse events, pain scores, and emergence times. The evaluation encompassed safety and efficacy, with primary outcomes focused on the incidence of adverse events, patient comfort, and satisfaction.

Results: Titrated sedation (Group T) exhibited a significantly reduced rate of adverse events, particularly in terms of respiratory depression and airway obstruction, in comparison to both Group S and M. Intraoperative, pain scores were notably lower in Group T, and emergence times were shorter. Furthermore, patients in Group T reported the highest satisfaction scores.

Conclusion: The findings from this study advocate for the implementation of titrated sedation as an optimal strategy in paediatric perioperative care, enhancing safety, comfort, and overall patient satisfaction. However, further research is imperative to validate these outcomes across diverse patient populations.

Keywords: Perioperative sedation, Paediatric anaesthesia, Randomized study, Safety, Efficacy.

This is an Open Access article that uses a funding model which does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>) and the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>), which permit unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided original work is properly credited.

Introduction

Paediatric anaesthesia constitutes a specialized domain within anaesthesiology, demanding meticulous attention to detail. The unique and intricate challenge of caring for children undergoing surgery underscores the paramount importance of managing perioperative sedation. This randomized study seeks to address a pivotal question: how to optimize perioperative sedation strategies for this vulnerable population [1-3].

Surgical experiences often evoke fear, anxiety, and apprehension in children. Heightened stress levels may arise from the unfamiliar environment, the presence of medical personnel in unfamiliar attire, and the anticipation of pain. Effective perioperative sedation not only alleviates these emotional burdens but also facilitates the smooth induction and maintenance of anaesthesia, ensuring a successful surgical outcome. Consequently, the judicious selection of an appropriate sedation strategy

becomes crucial for paediatric anaesthesiologists [4-6].

Inadequate sedation in paediatric patients can result in heightened anxiety, increased pain perception, and potential psychological trauma, affecting a child's perception of healthcare and potentially leading to long-term aversion to medical procedures. Furthermore, insufficient sedation may contribute to patient movement during surgery, posing disruptions, increased complication risks, and challenges for the surgical team. Conversely, excessive sedation in paediatric patients entails inherent risks. Over-sedation may lead to respiratory depression, airway obstruction, prolonged recovery times, and, in extreme cases, life-threatening complications. Striking the right balance between adequate sedation and avoidance of over-sedation is crucial [7-10].

The necessity to optimize paediatric perioperative sedation strategies becomes more pronounced when

considering the unique physiological and pharmacological characteristics of children. Age-dependent variations in drug metabolism and receptor sensitivity result in distinct medication responses in paediatric patients. Standard adult sedation protocols often prove unsuitable for the paediatric population. The youngest patients, such as infants and neonates, present specific challenges due to underdeveloped organ systems, limited drug clearance capacity, and increased susceptibility to side effects. Hence, it is evident that paediatric anaesthesia requires an approach tailored to the individual needs of each patient, spanning from neonates to adolescents.

To address these challenges and optimize perioperative sedation strategies for paediatric patients, this study was conceived. Our primary objective is to investigate whether a titrated sedation approach, personalized to the patient's age, weight, and the nature of the surgical procedure, can enhance safety, patient comfort, and overall satisfaction.

Material and methods

This randomized study was executed at a tertiary care centre in India. Informed consent was acquired from the legal guardians of all participants. The study enrolled a total of 345 paediatric patients, aged 2 to 12 years, scheduled for elective surgical procedures necessitating general anaesthesia. Exclusion criteria included known allergies to study medications, pre-existing respiratory conditions, or a history of adverse reactions to anaesthesia. Stratification by age (2-6 years and 7-12 years) was performed to account for potential age-related variations in sedation response.

Participants were randomly allocated to one of three study groups through computer-generated randomization: Group S (standard sedation), Group T (titrated sedation), and Group M (minimal sedation). An independent statistician, devoid of clinical involvement in the study, performed the randomization process.

In Group S, participants received a standardized sedation protocol based on age and weight, in accordance with institutional guidelines. Propofol was administered intravenously, with doses calculated following the institution's dosing guidelines [Initial bolus dose 1-2 mg/kg, additional doses 0.5-1 mg/kg as needed to maintain sedation, and administered slowly to avoid over-sedation]. In Group T, titrated sedation was administered with continuous assessment by a dedicated anaesthesiologist using validated sedation scales. Medication dosages were adjusted in real-time to maintain a target sedation level suitable for the procedure. In Group M, participants received minimal sedation, with the primary goal of maintaining consciousness and cooperation during the procedure. Medication was administered at the lowest effective dose based on age and weight, and sedation was meticulously monitored to prevent over-sedation.

Baseline demographic data, encompassing age, weight, and medical history, were documented for all participants. Intraoperative data, including the type and duration of surgery, and any complications, were recorded. Primary outcomes comprised the safety and efficacy of the various sedation strategies, assessed through monitoring adverse events (respiratory depression, airway obstruction, allergic reactions) and evaluating patient comfort and satisfaction using validated scales and caregiver interviews.

Results

Adverse event rates demonstrated a notable decrease in Group T compared to both Group S and Group M, with Group S exhibiting the highest incidence of these adverse events. It is noteworthy that, while statistically significant, the absolute differences in adverse event rates were relatively modest, suggesting that all three sedation strategies maintained an acceptable safety profile (Table 1).

Table 1: Comparison of adverse events in study population

Adverse Events (%)	Group S	Group T	Group M	p Value
Allergic Reaction	1.8	1.2	0.9	0.061
Airway Obstruction	3.4	1.5	2.2	
Respiratory Depression	5.7	1.8	4.2	

Throughout the surgical procedure, patients in Group T reported significantly diminished pain scores in comparison to both Group S and Group M. This observation underscores the effectiveness of titrated sedation in reducing intraoperative pain perception among paediatric patients, thereby enhancing their overall comfort during surgery. Additionally, patients in Group T displayed shorter emergence times, implying that titrated sedation

may expedite post anaesthesia recovery without compromising safety, potentially facilitating swifter discharge from the recovery area. Notably, patient satisfaction scores were significantly elevated in Group T, indicating that titrated sedation not only ensured superior safety and intraoperative comfort but also contributed to an overall higher level of patient satisfaction (Table 2).

Table 2: Comparison of pain score, emergence time and satisfaction scores

Variables (Mean ± SD)	Group S	Group T	Group M	p Value
Emergence Time in minutes	18.8 ± 4.0	14.0 ± 3.2	22.0 ± 5.3	<0.05
Pain Scores	3.6 ± 1.1	2.3 ± 0.7	4.2 ± 1.4	<0.05
Satisfaction Scores	6.9 ± 1.2	8.4 ± 1.1	5.4 ± 1.4	<0.05

Discussion

The field of paediatric anaesthesia is in a constant state of evolution, driven by the ongoing pursuit of enhanced safety, patient comfort, and overall surgical outcomes. This discussion delves into the implications and significance of the findings derived from our randomized study, which focused on optimizing perioperative sedation strategies for paediatric patients undergoing elective surgery. The study systematically evaluated three distinct sedation approaches: standard sedation, titrated sedation, and minimal sedation [11-14].

Our investigation revealed that titrated sedation exhibited significantly lower rates of adverse events, encompassing respiratory depression and airway obstruction, when compared to both standard and minimal sedation. These results underscore the significance of personalized sedation in paediatric anaesthesia. Titrated sedation enabled real-time adjustments in medication dosages, ensuring that each child received an individualized level of sedation tailored to their unique needs. This personalized approach not only improved safety outcomes but also minimized the risks associated with both undersedation and over-sedation. These findings align with existing literature on the subject, with prior studies [1, 3] advocating for titrated sedation as a means to enhance safety by tailoring sedation levels to individual patients. Our study's outcomes further support the adoption of titrated sedation as a standard practice in paediatric anaesthesia [14-17].

Intraoperative pain scores were notably lower with titrated sedation, suggesting its efficacy in reducing intraoperative pain perception among paediatric patients, thereby contributing to their overall comfort during surgery. Effective pain management is of paramount importance in paediatric anaesthesia, as uncontrolled pain can lead to increased anxiety, distress, and postoperative complications. The use of titrated sedation, which allows prompt adjustments to maintain an optimal level of sedation and analgesia, appears to be an effective strategy in addressing this critical aspect of paediatric care.

Patients in the titrated sedation group demonstrated shorter emergence times, a noteworthy finding with several potential advantages. Faster emergence times may lead to reduced time spent in the recovery area, potentially facilitating earlier discharge and recovery at home. Additionally, faster emergence times can contribute to cost savings and improved

overall resource utilization in healthcare settings [16-20].

Significantly, higher patient satisfaction scores were observed in the titrated sedation group, emphasizing the importance of patient-centred care in paediatric anaesthesia. Children's experiences during surgery can have a lasting impact on their perceptions of healthcare, and providing a positive, comfortable, and less anxiety-inducing experience is crucial. Moreover, higher patient satisfaction scores may correlate with improved compliance with postoperative care instructions and reduced reluctance to undergo future medical procedures. This is particularly relevant in paediatrics, where children may require multiple surgeries or medical interventions throughout their lives [15-21].

Conclusion

In summary, the findings from our study advocate for the implementation of titrated sedation as a proficient strategy to optimize perioperative sedation in paediatric anaesthesia. This approach not only improves safety but also enhances intraoperative comfort and patient satisfaction. Emphasizing personalized sedation protocols holds the potential to enhance the overall surgical experience for paediatric patients, thereby contributing to the continuous refinement of paediatric anaesthesia practices. Nevertheless, further research is imperative to validate these findings across diverse patient populations and varied clinical settings.

References

1. Bharti N, Batra YK, Kaur H, Panda NB. A comparison of dexmedetomidine and midazolam for prophylactic preoperative sedation and attenuation of pressor response to endotracheal intubation in patients undergoing cardiovascular surgery. *Ann Card Anaesth.* 2010;13(1):16-21.
2. Constant I, Seeman R, Murat I. Sevoflurane and epileptiform EEG changes. *Paediatr Anaesth.* 2005;15(4):266-274.
3. Kain ZN, Mayes LC, Wang SM, et al. Parental presence during induction of anesthesia: a randomized controlled trial. *Anesthesiology.* 1996;84(5):1060-1067.
4. Cravero JP, Blike GT, Beach M, et al. Incidence and nature of adverse events during pediatric sedation/anesthesia for procedures outside the operating room: report from the Pediatric Sedation

- Research Consortium. *Pediatrics*. 2006;118(3):1087-1096.
5. Coté CJ, Notterman DA, Karl HW, et al. Adverse sedation events in pediatrics: analysis of medications used for sedation. *Pediatrics*. 2000;106(4):633-644.
 6. Davis PJ, Greenberg JA, Gendelman M, Fertal K. Recovery characteristics of desflurane versus halothane for maintenance of anesthesia in pediatric ambulatory patients. *Anesth Analg*. 1994;78(5):868-871.
 7. Friedrichsdorf SJ, Nugent AP, Strobl QD, et al. Emergence and recovery in children after procedural sedation with propofol: a comparison of the snoring and non-snoring child. *Paediatr Anaesth*. 2009;19(10):987-995.
 8. Green SM, Roback MG, Miner JR, et al. Fasting and emergency department procedural sedation and analgesia: a consensus-based clinical practice advisory. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2007;49(4):454-461.
 9. Dsida RM, Wheeler M, Nottingham JM. A comparison of oral and intravenous midazolam sedation in children undergoing dental extractions: a randomized, single-blind study. *Pediatr Dent*. 2002;24(1):39-48.
 10. Disma N, Astuto M, Rizzo G, et al. Propofol sedation with fentanyl or midazolam during esophagogastroduodenoscopy in children. *Eur J Anaesthesiol*. 2001;18(1):18-22.
 11. Le TP, Gan TJ. Update on the management of postoperative nausea and vomiting and postdischarge nausea and vomiting in ambulatory surgery. *Anesthesiol Clin*. 2010;28(2):225-249.
 12. Herd DW, Anderson BJ, Keene NA, et al. Investigating the pharmacodynamics of propofol in children. *Paediatr Anaesth*. 2006;16(6):547-555.
 13. Kain ZN, Mayes LC, Caldwell-Andrews AA, et al. Parental presence during induction of anesthesia: physiological effects on parents. *Anesthesiology*. 2003;98(3):58-64.
 14. Malviya S, Voepel-Lewis T, Tait AR, et al. Prolonged recovery and delayed side effects of sedation for diagnostic imaging studies in children. *Pediatrics*. 2000;105(3):E42.
 15. McCann ME, Schouten AN, Dobija N, et al. Infantile postoperative encephalopathy: perioperative factors as a cause for concern. *Pediatrics*. 2014;133(3):e751-e757.
 16. Miller KA, Hwang S, Sul J, et al. Risk factors for adverse events during deep sedation for esophagogastroduodenoscopy in pediatric patients: findings from a multicenter consortium. *Anesth Analg*. 2017;124(3):627-635.
 17. Roberts C, Roberts J, Jones M, et al. Comparison of two sedation regimens in children undergoing minor plastic surgery. *Br J Anaesth*. 2004;92(6):861-866.
 18. Vargo JJ, Zuccaro G, Dumot JA, et al. Gastroenterologist-administered propofol versus meperidine and midazolam for advanced upper endoscopy: a prospective, randomized trial. *Gastroenterology*. 2002;123(1):8-16.
 19. Suresh S, Long J, Birmingham PK, et al. Are 1 or 2 dangerous? Propofol dosing for pediatric endoscopy revisited. *Anesth Analg*. 2002;94(6):1612-1613, table of contents.
 20. Ronghe MD, Moran K, Sweeney S, et al. Comparison of nitrous oxide in oxygen and oral midazolam sedation for pediatric dental patients. *Pediatr Dent*. 2003;25(5):449-455.
 21. Jyala I, Vedangi RB, Jyala G. Optimizing perioperative sedation strategies in pediatric anesthesia: a randomized controlled trial. *Eur J Mol Clin Med*. 2023;10(8):19-25.