American Research Journal of Anesthesia

Volume 1, Issue 1, 27-31 Pages
Research Article | Open Access

AMERICAN RESEARCH JOURNALS
An Academic Publishing House

Anesthesia and the Developing Brain: A Way forward for Clinical Research

Andrew G[1], Davidson[2], Nicola Disma[3]

[1]Anaesthesia and Pain Management Research Group, Murdoch Childrens Research Institute, Melbourne, Vic., Australia.
[2]Department of Anaesthesia and Pain Management, The Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne, Vic., Australia.
[3]Department of Paediatrics, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Vic., Australia.

ABSTRACT

Several general anesthetic effects on the developing brain in animal models have already been documented. Contrary to the results of human cohort studies, there is no clear evidence of a link between early children anesthetic exposure and neurobehavioral outcomes. Despite extensive study, it is still unclear whether or not the findings from animal studies have any use in human medicine, or even whether any changes to clinical practice are necessary. In light of the large number of children who have general anesthesia procedures, the answers to these concerns are crucial. Researchers and physicians met recently in Genoa to discuss the future of clinical trials. These debates and their outcomes are described in this work. Observational studies with a high sample size, as well as clinical trials with precise design parameters, were deemed essential. There is no way to completely rule out the possibility that anesthetics can cause long-term neurobehavioural changes in humans; however, observational studies will help us better understand which children are most at risk and may also reveal possible underlying causes, and clinical trials will provide the strongest evidence to test the efficacy of different strategies or anesthetises.

KEYWORDS: *Pediatric neurodevelopment, general anesthesia, clinical trials, observational studies, and clinical research are all included in these.*

INTRODUCTION

Research into how anesthetics affect the developing brain is becoming more and more complicated and difficult (1,2). It's difficult to tell what all of this implies for clinical practice since animal research is difficult to translate and human studies have inherent limitations, but a slew of recent reviews synthesize these results (3–8) (3–8). To be sure, additional research is needed; but where should this study be focused? Genoa, Italy hosted a 2-day conference on

"Pediatric Anesthesia and Neurotoxicity: From the GAS Study to Future Collaborative Trials" as part of the GAS funding from the Italian Ministry of Health on May 23–24, 2014. Research on the effects of anesthetics on developing brains was summarized during the workshop, and important questions that would drive subsequent large collaborative clinical trials were developed along with various research designs to address those issues. Anesthetists, researchers, project managers, neonatal doctors and neurologists, as well as leaders of the pediatric anesthesia community, were all in attendance. For preclinical discoveries to be translated into clinical research, collaboration across both professions is vital. This ensures that both animal and clinical research are relevant to clinical practice in the future. This document sums up the most important points made during the conference. The existing state of knowledge was given and summarized in terms of what we know and what we don't know before formulating future questions (Table 1). Many animal investigations have shown that extended anesthetic exposures may have some kind of harmful consequence. While some epidemiological studies have shown a link between surgery (with anesthesia) at a young age and neurobehavioural outcomes, others have not.

Aspects of clinical research that should be prioritized

The clinical research agenda might be driven by a number of fundamental methods. If anesthetics have any clinically meaningful toxicity in humans, one strategy is to investigate this. To see whether we can continue using anesthetic drugs and persuade the public that they are'safe' for youngsters, in other words. Our first step is to ensure that these drugs do not pose a risk in any clinically relevant circumstances. Accepting that anesthetics do have clinically important negative effects on people and doing research to investigate how this impact might be minimized; or to establish the threshold of exposure or age at which effects are minimal, is an alternate strategy to anesthesia use. Another option is to not assume that the poor neurobehavioral outcome after surgery is directly connected to the preclinical neurotoxicity

data found before to the procedure. How can we identify the group most at risk for poor neurobehavioral outcome? Do easily accessible alternate anesthetic or perioperative methods enhance outcomes? While the symphony was playing,

Table 1 Summary of the current state of knowledge regarding the effects of anesthetics on the developing brain

What we already know
1 In animal experiments, many general anesthetics have a variety of effects on the developing brain; including apoptotic cell death and impaired synapto-genesis. Some of these effects are consistent with potential long-term alterations in neurological function. There currently does not exist clear evidence that similar effects do, or do not, occur in the developing human brain if it is exposed to sufficient doses of general anesthetics
2 The changes are greatest in very young animals and the effects and regions affected may depend on anesthetic dose, agent, and age of exposure
3 There is mixed evidence for an association between anesthesia and poor neurodevelopment in animal models
4 Some general anesthetics or sedatives produce greater effects than others in the animal model
5 Some interventions mitigate the changes observed in the developing animal brain
6 Several plausible mechanisms have been implicated to play a role
7 There is mixed evidence for an association between surgery with anesthesia in early childhood and increased risk for poor neurobehavioral outcome
What we do not know (with a focus on clinical data)
1 Which children (in terms of dose and age at exposure) are at greatest risk of poor developmental outcome
2 Which neurological domains in humans are affected, and how this may change with dose and age at exposure
3 The mechanism for the association between surgery/anesthesia and increased risk of poor neurodevelopmental outcome in humans. Hypotension, inflammation, direct neuronal toxicity, etc. may all play a role
4 How surgery or the possible neuroprotective effects of anesthesia may influence any toxicity
5 Which interventions would reduce the risk of poor neurodevelopmental outcome in humans

In preclinical investigations, anesthetic effects were shown to be a likely contributory mechanism, although other variables such as genetic predisposition, neuroinflammation, and hypotension may also play a role. Pragmatic trials might be used even if the underlying process has not been completely understood.

Study designs based on observation

Clinical research will continue to begin with observational studies. The groups most at risk and the outcomes most influenced by future comprehensive prospective observational studies must be clearly defined. Perioperative data may provide provide insight into the most probable processes at play. To organize future studies, it is important to identify the people most at risk. Future observational studies will need to incorporate exposure and perioperative care information, as well as outcome evaluations across several domains, in order to address these issues. In contrast to retrospective research, which are likely to fall short, ambidirectional or prospective investigations should provide more reliable results. Sample size must be big enough to identify even small correlations between numerous perioperative variables and many outcome domains in these investigations. However, the Mayo Anesthesia Safety in Kids (MASK) research (12) and the Raine Cohort studies (13) may not give enough information to solve all of these problems. There are a number of things to keep in mind while planning future large-scale observational research.

How much time should be given to the experiment?

Both the GAS study1 and the PANDA project (14), are now under progress. It's possible that they can appropriately answer questions about a brief exposure. Short exposure (less than one hour) and neurobehavioral outcomes may not be linked, but the issue of extended exposures remains unanswered even if they don't. Indeed, animal and human research have shown that higher anesthetic dosages and longer exposures might have a stronger impact. As a result, investigations in the future should concentrate on longer durations of exposure. Multiple exposures may be more effective than a single one, according to some research.

What age range should we take into account?

If the younger population is more at danger, this should be balanced by the increased number of older children who have been exposed. In other words, given the increased number of children exposed at an earlier age, even a tiny impact size in an older kid may have huge socio-economic effects. An justification may be made for studying children of all ages.

Do controlled studies that concentrate on a specific technique have a leg up over uncontrolled studies that include a broader range of subjects?

Any possible dosage response and relationships between perioperative variables and outcome may both be found via anesthetic practice heterogeneity. Multi-site research might improve this. However, the bigger the number of anesthetic treatments and surgical procedures, the less probable it is that any one link may be identified. At this point, it seems reasonable to begin with a wide and diverse population in order to study a variety of potential links, and then test these connections prospectively in later studies under more controlled circumstances.

Does the result depend on any further co-factors?

The surgical procedure is the most significant co-factor. It may be possible to focus on the effects of anesthesia on children who undergo anesthesia for non-surgical reasons, rather than on children who have surgery (such as inflammation and pain). One anesthetic for imaging examinations would be an example. Other potential confounding factors, such as the condition that necessitated imaging, perioperative hypotension, and other co-morbidities, might apply to such a cohort. Gender is another crucial issue to consider while doing an observational research. The requirement for surgery (such as an inguinal hernia repair) and the neurobehavioral result may both be influenced by gender. Preclinical investigations have shown that a person's gender may affect their sensitivity to toxins. In addition to socioeconomic status and maternal education, poor neurobehavioral outcomes are significantly linked to these factors. Higher socio-economic status, on the other hand, may be linked to a greater ability for damage recovery. To summarize, there is no guarantee that anesthetic will have any effect on a patient's prognosis

because of factors such as surgery, co-morbidity and illness, pain, hypotension, gender, maternal education, and socio-economic position. An crucial yet tough task is to reduce or account for this confounding.

Which result and at what age should be examined?

Neurobehavioral domains may be examined at a later age, which gives a more accurate prediction of long-term outcomes. However, when the time interval between exposure and neuropsychological testing lengthens, so do the study durations, the number of intervening life events, and the chance of study participants falling through the cracks. In an ideal world, testing would take place over a period of time, with older age being the most desirable. Neuropsychological exams' greatest usefulness is still a mystery. The potential of identifying domain-specific effects is increased when a large number of outcomes are tested, but this also raises the risk that some relationships may arise only by accident. There has to be more effort done to examine all the preclinical and clinical data before any further trials are planned to select the tests that are most likely to be useful. Problems arise when different results are influenced by factors such as how the agent was utilized and when it was administered. If we could anticipate long-term outcomes using reliable biomarkers and/or neuroimaging, we could design better outcome studies. If there is an associated genetic component, collecting genetic data may be informative.

Observational studies have many drawbacks

When it comes to determining whether or not preclinical findings have any bearing on human health, observational studies may be unable to address this issue. Anesthesia may be linked to a bad result, but the operation and comorbidities variables complicate things further. If no correlations are detected in big studies with a wide sample, this does not rule out the possibility of impacts in certain high-risk groups. Observational studies are unlikely to be comprehensive enough to rule out correlations across all subgroups and areas of outcome.

Design of studies that are prospectively randomized

Because nonrandom confounding is reduced, a randomized experiment is a more potent instrument for answering the issue of causation. Trials are costly, time-consuming, and difficult to conduct. Hence, to optimize return on investment, it is necessary to design the precise question the experiment would answer ideally before it begins. Designing a clinical trial necessitates defining the population, intervention, control, and desired result from the outset.

The population can be defined, right?

This is true for both cohort and observational studies when it comes to the research population. For a prospective experiment to address the question of whether or not anesthetics may alter future neurobehavioral outcomes, the group that preclinical and epidemiological research suggest is most at risk should be the primary target. Younger children who have been exposed for an extended period of time are more likely to be affected. Because of its potential influence on society and clinical significance, it is important to take into account the number of children who are exposed to a certain level of exposure at a certain age.

Is it possible to identify the ideal result for measuring?

Trial concerns are, once again, quite similar to observational study issues. A trial's main outcomes should be balanced between those that are most likely to change based on current data and those that are considered most significant for the individual's quality of life or the societal effect. Certainly, secondary outcomes should be evaluated in every study. For this reason, it is important to consider all of the information before drawing any firm conclusions about the significance of small impacts in certain subfields.

Should we try any particular treatment?

There are a variety of ways to intervene. Carbon monoxide, lithium, melatonin and hypothermia have all been shown to be effective in preclinical investigations to protect against Parkinson's disease. We don't have enough information on the probable dosage, effectiveness, and safety of these medicines to proceed with human studies at this time, which is unfortunate. Different anesthetics/sedatives or dosages might be compared as another option. Preclinical evidence imply that an opioid-based approach with or without an alpha2 agonist may provide a less toxic option to an anesthesia regimen employing volatile anesthetics, although animal research have yet to identify an anesthetic that is fully "nontoxic." Opioid-based techniques, whether with or without an alpha2 agonist, are interesting in principle, but there are presently little data on whether they are suitable and practicable in children. To reduce the amount of volatile anesthetic, other options include increasing the dosage of opioids or alpha2 agonists or doing a dose comparison between two different doses of volatile anesthetic.

Both the trial and the issue

A trial's strategy or question should always be at the forefront of the design process. One goal may be to see whether anesthetics ever induce clinically meaningful neurotoxicity in people, as previously indicated. Using preclinical data, a trial would be conducted on the most vulnerable groups (i.e., infants and those who had undergone many hours of anesthesia), and the "nontoxic" anesthetic approach would be compared against the "most toxic" anesthetic technique. As a result, the study would need a large number of participants to evaluate equivalency in a variety of areas. Neuropsychological tests are more sensitive at a later age, hence this result would have to be evaluated at a later age.

Preclinical research have shown that these effects may not be relevant to people if this experiment fails to find a difference in those who are most at risk. There is a good chance that this trial design is not practical. In animal research to yet, no 'nontoxic' anesthetic has been established for comparison's sake. The "highest risk" group, which includes youngsters who get extended anesthetics at a young age, also has extremely few members. In order to bring in the necessary amount of people, it would be almost impossible. The prevalence of co-morbidity in these children is also likely to increase the variability in their outcomes and the danger of random confounding. Alternatively, one might be more realistic in their approach. Even while such a pragmatic study cannot completely eliminate the chance of harm, it would have a greater influence on clinical practice because of its greater clinical relevance. The trial would be a synthesis of theoretical knowledge and practical experience. A 'less toxic' anesthetic regimen in a high-risk but routinely anesthetized population should be used instead of the most demonstrably nontoxic anesthetic in the highest-risk group. Finally, while planning a study, keep in mind variables like blood pressure, oxygen saturation, and hypocapnia that might affect the conclusion. Testing the "neurotoxic" impact would need controlling for many variables. Controlling for these factors may not be necessary in a more pragmatic effectiveness study, which may regard them as part of the causation route.

Clinical studies face several difficulties

For clinical studies testing anesthetic neurotoxicity, the major problems include high expense and ethical requirements, as well as logistical issues. When a question is well defined, trials are more readily understood. Before beginning a trial, it is critical to identify the most relevant questions. To ensure the safety and viability of new anesthetic procedures before conducting a big randomized study, open-label pilot trials should be conducted first. Similarly, if new procedures are to be used, more preclinical and preferably primate testing is needed to properly identify toxicity.

CONCLUSION

Anesthetic effects on the developing brain must be clarified in future preclinical investigations to find potential mitigating measures. Translation to humans, on the other hand, will continue to be a challenge. An observational research or trial that can conclusively determine whether the anesthetic effects shown in preclinical investigations have any relevance to people should be designed. While it is unlikely that such a research could ever be designed and executed in reality, the prospect that anesthetics may cause long-term neurobehavioural alterations in people cannot be fully excluded. We may learn more about the most vulnerable youngsters via observational research, which may also point to possible underlying causes. Observational and preclinical research should give significant data to examine the efficiency of alternative techniques or anesthetic regimes for improved neurobehavioral outcomes in clinical trials. " Large, comprehensive, prospective, observational research and clinical trials are needed by all of the conference participants. These investigations will need extensive consultation with a wide range of relevant parties. They will also have to be carried out at various locations. They'll need to work together if they want to be successful.

REFERENCES

1. Hansen TG. Anesthesia-related neurotoxicity and the developing animal brain is not a significant problem in children. Pediatr Anesth 2015; 25: 65–72.
2. Vutskits L, Davis PJ, Hansen TG. Anesthetics and the developing brain: time for a change in practice? A pro/con debate Pediatr Anesth 2012; 22: 973–980.
3. Gleich S, Nemergut M, Flick R. Anestheticrelated neurotoxicity in young children: an update. Curr Opin Anaesthesiol 2013; 26: 340–347.
4. Davidson AJ. Anesthesia and neurotoxicity to the developing brain: the clinical relevance. Pediatr Anesth 2011; 21: 716–721.
5. Lei SY, Hache M, Loepke AW. Clinical research into anesthetic neurotoxicity: does anesthesia cause neurological abnormalities in humans? J Neurosurg Anesthesiol 2014; 26: 349–357.
6. Lin EP, Soriano SG, Loepke AW. Anesthetic neurotoxicity. Anesthesiol Clin 2014; 32: 133–155.
7. Jevtovic-Todorovic V, Absalom AR, Blomgren K et al. Anaesthetic neurotoxicity and neuroplasticity: an expert group report and statement based on the BJA Salzburg Seminar. Br J Anaesth 2013; 111: 143–151.
8. Miller TL, Park R, Sun LS. Report of the fourth PANDA symposium on 'Anesthesia and Neurodevelopment in Children'. J Neurosurg Anesthesiol 2014; 26: 344–348.
9. Nemergut ME, Aganga D, Flick RP. Anesthetic neurotoxicity: what to tell the parents? Pediatr Anesth 2014; 24: 120–126.
10. Davidson AJ. Neurotoxicity and the need for anesthesia in the newborn: does the emperor have no clothes? Anesthesiology 2012; 116: 507–509.
11. Weiss M, Bissonnette B, Engelhardt T et al. Anesthetists rather than anesthetics are the threat to baby brains. Pediatr Anesth 2013; 23: 881–882.
12. Gleich SJ, Flick R, Hu D et al. Neurodevelopment of children exposed to anesthesia: design of the Mayo Anesthesia Safety in Kids (MASK) study. Contemp Clin Trials 2014; 41C: 45–54.

13. Ing CH, DiMaggio CJ, Malacova E et al. Comparative analysis of outcome measures used in examining neurodevelopmental effects of early childhood anesthesia exposure. Anesthesiology 2014; 120: 1319–1332.

14. Sun LS, Li G, DiMaggio CJ et al. Feasibility and pilot study of the Pediatric Anesthesia NeuroDevelopment Assessment (PANDA) project. J Neurosurg Anesthesiol 2012; 24: 382–388.

Citation: Andrew G, Davidson, Nicola Disma, "Anesthesia and the Developing Brain: A Way forward for Clinical Research", American Research Journal of Anesthesia, Vol 1, no. 1, 2022, pp. 27-31.