Original Research Paper

Volume - 13 | Issue - 12 | December - 2023 | PRINT ISSN No. 2249 - 555X | DOI : 10.36106/ijar

Anesthesiology

RISK OF ANAESTHESIA OR SEDATION OUTSIDE THE OPERATING ROOM

Hadeel Abdulaziz Alsunbel	Senior Anesthesia care practitioner, Prince sultan military medical city
Mada Saad Aladwani	Operating Department Senior Specialist, Prince Sultan Military Medical City
Mohammed Ismail Almohammed Ali	Anesthesia Consultant, Prince Sultan Military Medical City
Anwar Bader Alsaleh	Senior anaesthesia care practitioner, Prince Sultan Military Medical City
Abdullah Yahya Faisal Alqahtani	Nurse specialist, Al Eman general hospital

ABSTRACT **Background:** The medicine used for procedural sedation and analgesia PSA was determined not only by intensivists to maintain hemodynamic stability but also by the patient's needs based on the duration of the procedure and drug sensitization. **Methods:** The evaluation should cover the following components: medical history, including a history of comorbid disorders and surgical history, previous sedation and general anaesthesia, drugs, allergies, fasting status, dental status, and the existence of prosthesis and the physical examination **Conclusions:** Because of the rising use of diagnostic instruments and procedural treatment procedures, the demand for sedation and anaesthesia outside of the OR is increasing. When selecting sedatives and analgesics, it is critical to understand their characteristics and side effects because the degree or depth of sedation required to improve the patient's stability and assure the procedure's success may vary.

KEYWORDS : Non-operating Room Anaesthesia, Risk Of Anaesthesia, Sedation, Sedation Outside The Operating Room.

1. INTRODUCTION

As medicine advances and diseases become more complex, patients' needs range from painless diagnostic radiography to terrifying, unpleasant operations. Inadequate sedation may result in failed treatments and other negative consequences for both families and patients. [1] As a result, sedation providers should be trained in sedative drug delivery, physiologic monitoring, sedation level assessment, and adverse event management.When emergency conditions are not effectively treated, general anaesthesia generates physiological responses that can result in morbidity and mortality.[2] As a result, it is viewed as a high-risk activity in which the advantages of surgery must outweigh the risks. Although death from anaesthetic management is uncommon, it can occur due to pulmonary aspiration of gastrointestinal contents, asphyxiation, or allergy.[3] These adverse events might be caused by anesthesia-related equipment failure or, more commonly, by human mistake. However, multiple researchers and professional organisations have reported that anaesthesia-related death rates have reduced during the last two decades. This decline is attributed to advancements in safety, such as improved detection and monitoring systems and new technologies, modernization, widespread adoption of practice standards, and other quality improvement efforts to reduce errors. Anaesthesia is now widely regarded as safe and effective, particularly when administered by a competent and well-trained anaesthesia physician.[4]

2. Literature review

The medicine used for procedural sedation and analgesia PSA was determined not only by intensivists to maintain hemodynamic stability but also by the patient's needs based on the duration of the procedure and drug sensitization. Due to chronic underlying medical and surgical issues and anxiety, several patients required many sedative drugs and multiple dosages to obtain the desired level of relaxation.Painful stimuli were thought to protect against continuing respiratory activity during PSA.[5] Previous research by Grunwell et al. 2016 described the efficacy of PSA by a well-trained sedation team and a high-quality sedation service system.Nonoperating room anaesthesia (NORA) is the delivery of sedation or anaesthesia to patients undergoing unpleasant or difficult procedures outside of the operation room.[6]

Anesthesiologists are regularly asked to give NORA in these remote areas, but they do not always grasp the significance of safety standards for equipment, personnel, and facilities. Because anesthesiologists giving NORA are responsible for both the patient's and their own safety, these criteria should not be overlooked. [7]

2.1 Classification of Anesthesia:

Analgesia or Disorientation: This stage can begin in a preoperative anesthesiology holding room, when the patient is given medication and may begin to feel its effects but has not yet become unconscious. This is commonly referred to as the "induction stage." Patients are drugged but talkative. Breathing is slow and consistent. At this point, the patient advances from analgesia without amnesia to analgesia with amnesia. The loss of consciousness marks the conclusion of this stage.[8]

Excitement or Delirium: Symptoms of this stage include disinhibition, delirium, uncontrolled movements, lack of eyelash reflex, hypertension, and tachycardia. During this stage, airway reflexes remain intact and are frequently responsive to stimuli. Airway manipulation, including the introduction and removal of endotracheal tubes and deep suctioning manoeuvres, should be avoided during this stage of anaesthesia. [9] At this point, there is a greater risk of laryngospasm (involuntary tonic closure of the vocal cords), which may be exacerbated by any airway manipulation. As a result, the combination of spastic movements, vomiting, and rapid, erratic breathing can endanger the patient's airway. Fast-acting medicines serve to shorten the time spent in stage 2 and facilitate progression to stage 3.[10]

Stage 3 - Surgical Anaesthesia: This is the anaesthetic stage that is used for procedures that need general anaesthesia. This stage is distinguished by slowed eye movements and respiratory depression. At this level, airway manipulation is risk-free. For this step, four "planes" are detailed. Plane 1 still has regular spontaneous respiration, restricted pupils, and a centred gaze. However, on this level, eyelid, conjunctival, and swallow reflexes frequently disappear. There are intermittent cessations of respiration and loss of corneal and laryngeal reflexes during plane 2. Ocular movements may be slowed and lacrimation may increase. Plane 3 is distinguished by total relaxation of the intercostal and abdominal muscles, as well as the absence of the pupillary light reaction. [11]

Overdose: This stage occurs when anaesthetic agents are administered in excess of the amount of surgical stimulation, resulting in the

worsening of an already severe brain condition or medullary depression. This stage begins with respiratory failure and concludes with death. At this stage, the skeletal muscles are flaccid, and the pupils are fixed and dilated. Blood pressure is usually substantially lower than normal, with weak and thready pulses caused by cardiac pump inhibition and vasodilation in the peripheral circulation. This stage is fatal without circulatory and respiratory care. As a result, the anaesthetist's goal is to move the patient to stage 3 anaesthesia as soon as possible and keep them there for the length of the procedure.[12]

3. METHODS

The evaluation should cover the following components: medical history, including a history of comorbid disorders and surgical history, previous sedation and general anaesthesia, drugs, allergies, fasting status, dental status, and the existence of prosthesis. The physical examination should include an assessment of the patient's airway, cardiovascular and respiratory condition, as well as any pertinent aspects of the patient's history.[13]

3.1 The following factors should be examined during the pre-sedation clinical evaluation:
Your current medical status and any surgical issues.
Body weight and height.
Medical history (including any previous sedation or anaesthesia).
Current or previous pharmaceutical use (including allergies).
This is a functional class.
Evaluation of the airway and cardiopulmonary system.
Anxiety symptoms and psychological condition

During the pre-sedation evaluation, it is critical to identify patients who are at risk of presenting adverse events, such as those with cardiovascular or respiratory risks or airway compromise; those with liver or kidney disease, morbid obesity, or obstructive sleep apnea syndrome; those at risk of bronchoaspiration; those who have a history of adverse events during previous sedations; and those over the age of 75. These patients, as well as others classified as ASA IV/V, who have a 5-7 times higher risk of adverse events due to sedation than ASA I/II patients, will require evaluation and management by an anesthesiology professional, as well as a setting with the necessary conditions for managing problems.[14]

Sedation outside of the operating room is not suggested for patients with ASA III and IV.

Bag valve masks, endotracheal tubes, laryngeal mask airways, resuscitation drugs, isotonic crystalloids, cuffed blood pressure, and pulse oximetry without capnography were among the resuscitation and monitoring equipment used. The nurse continuously monitored vital signs and oxygen saturation as a physician administered the medication. The level of consciousness and responsiveness of the patient were used to determine the depth of sedation. The standardised sedation records were used to report and document all significant changes in vital signs and problems. [15]

Patients requiring sedation outside the operating room should fast from solids for at least 6 hours prior to surgery.

When nitrous gas is used as the sole sedative without premedication in patients requiring sedation outside the operating room, no prior fasting is recommended.

In the case of emergency procedures in patients who have not fasted, the decision to utilise sedation must be considered with the urgency and medication used during the intervention in mind.[16]

4. RESULTS:

A. Nitrous oxide versus typical sedative drugs
A systematic evaluation of the literature (AMSTAR 8/11)20 assessed the safety and efficacy of nitrous oxide delivery for patient sedation outside the operating room. When compared to the traditional sedatives group (midazolam plus meperidine or ketobemidone, propofol or meperidine). However, as compared to propofol [28min vs. 28min; p=0.86], there was a lower frequency of bouts of hypoxemia (0% vs. 21% with midazolam plus meperidine, p=0.01) and a shorter recovery time [28min vs. 51 with midazolam plus fentanyl (MD 23min 95% CI 28.6 to 17.4)].

The evidence's quality was very low due to limitations in the possibility of bias and the precision of the results.[17]

b. Propofol vs. conventional agents
A systematic assessment of the literature (AMSTAR score 7/11)21 assessed the effectiveness and safety of propofol sedation outside the operating room. The evidence's quality was low due to some limitations in the risk of bias, precision, and consistency of outcomes.

c. Propofol in comparison to other conventional agents
A comprehensive analysis of the literature with an AMSTAR score of 8/11,22 assessed the safety and efficacy of propofol sedation alone or in combination with other drugs.

d. Propofol and fentanyl vs. ketamine and midazolam
When compared to the combined use of midazolam and fentanyl, patients assigned to propofol sedation reported a shorter recovery time (MD ٢١,٧min, ٩٥٪ CI ٢٨,٧ to ١٤,٧), but this was not reflected in a higher rate of successful procedures (RR ٤,٠٣, ٩٥٪ CI ٠,٤٠-٤٠,٣٨), episodes of hypotension (PD ٢,٦٪, ٩٥٪ CI ٤,٨٪ to ١٠,١٪), hypoxemia (PD ٣,١٪, ٩٥٪ CI.

The evidence's quality was very low due to limitations in the possibility of bias and the precision of the results.

e. Propofol plus conventional agents vs. Propofol alone
Propofol in combination with other traditional agents did not increase the frequency of hypoxemia (RR 0.93, 95% CI 0.30-2.92), hypotension (RR 1.32, 95% CI 0.30-2.92), apnea (RR 2.81, 95% CI 0.27-29.07) or cardiac arrhythmias (RR 2.61, 95% CI 0.23-29.99). The evidence's quality was very low due to limitations in the consistency and precision of the outcomes.

f. Dexmedetomidine verses Midazolam, for example
With an AMSTAR score of 5/11,27, a systematic evaluation of the literature judged the safety and effectiveness of using dexme detomidine for sedation outside the operation room.

When compared to midazolam alone or in combination with other traditional agents, patients given dexmedetomidine had a lower rate of procedure suspension (OR 0.07, 95% CI 0.01-0.45) and a higher level of sedation (standardised mean difference [SMD] 0.40 points, 95% CI, 0.11-0.69 on the Ramsay scale). However, there was no change in the frequency of hypoxemia (OR 0.45, 95% CI 0.10-2.11), hypotension (OR 1.37, 95% CI 0.52-3.64), or recovery time (MD 2.5min, 95% CI 7.3 to 2.3).

Because of limitations in the risk of bias, precision, and consistency of the results, the quality of the evidence was very low.

g. Oral medications
A systematic evaluation of the literature, with an AMSTAR score of 10/11,28 investigated the safety and efficacy of oral sedatives in patients having minor dental operations.

5. DISCUSSION

Sedation has the purpose of improving the patient experience by lowering pain and anxiety, which leads to increased compliance with prescribed screenings and follow-up.

Endoscopists aiming minimal to moderate sedation (endoscopist-directed sedation [EDS]) or anaesthesia experts typically targeting profound sedation or general anaesthesia (anesthesia-directed sedation [ADS]) are the most common sedation options.[18]

One of the most important factors in maintaining safe anaesthetic delivery in all circumstances is the presence of qualified and skilled anaesthetists. According to the American Society of Anesthesiologists, an anaesthetist with appropriate experience, a consultant, or an appropriate other with consultant supervision, must be present throughout general anaesthesia and use clinical skills and monitoring to provide continuous care for the patient throughout the procedure. [19]

Risk reduction in anaesthesia necessitates provider attentiveness as well as protocols, technology, settings, and an overall work system designed to promote safe care.

Older, more vulnerable patients; restricted access workspaces that may not support anaesthesia; a lack of team familiarity and support; inexperienced postoperative care teams; older equipment and fewer monitoring capabilities; and time constraints are all potential dangers in NORA.[20]

These factors have an impact on anaesthesia doctors' capacity to manage patient variability, surgical risk, equipment malfunctions, error-creating gadgets, and limited resources successfully.

The Anaesthesia Patient Safety Foundation and the American Society of Anesthesiologists have both advocated adhering to the same anaesthetic care criteria established in the OR, such as enough space, the availability of equipment and supplies, and competent perioperative management.[21]

6. CONCLUSIONS

Because of the rising use of diagnostic instruments and procedural treatment procedures, the demand for sedation and anaesthesia outside of the OR is increasing. When selecting sedatives and analgesics, it is critical to understand their characteristics and side effects because the degree or depth of sedation required to improve the patient's stability and assure the procedure's success may vary. [22]

It is recommended to clinicians evaluate clinical history elements that may influence sedation success in order to reduce pain and promote patient participation throughout the procedure. These include age, gender, BMI, procedure duration, degree of anxiety, and anxious personality features.

It is recommended to health workers who give propofol sedation have proper training in order to maximise patient satisfaction and assure safety during the treatment.[23]

7. REFERENCES

1. Wall BF, Magee K, Campbell SG, Zed PJ. Capnography versus standard monitoring for emergency department procedural sedation and analgesia. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017;3:CD010698. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD010698.pub2
2. Pinto Filho WA, Silveira LHJ, Vale ML, Fernandes CR, Gomes JA. Gabapentin in Improvement of Procedural Sedation and Analgesia in Oncologic Pediatric Patients: A Clinical Trial. Anesth Pain Med. 2019;9(5):e91197. doi: 10.5812/aapm.91197.
3. Patel J, Fang J, Taylor LJ, Adler DG, Gawron AJ. Safety and efficacy of non-anesthesiologist administration of propofol sedation during esophago gastro duodenoscopy in the intensive care unit. Endosc Int Open. 2019;7(4):E625–9. doi: 10.1055/a-0829-6284.
4. American Society of Anesthesiologists. Standards &Guidelines, Guidelines for Office-Based Anesthesia; 2015 [citado ٢٨ Mar ٢٠١٧]. Disponible en: https://goo.gl/cdLvFB .
5. Rubiano-Pinzón AM, Burbano-Paredes CC,Hernández-Caicedo AC, Rincón-Valenzuela DA,Benavides-Caro CA, Restrepo-Palacio S, et al. Currículo para laadministración de sedación fuera del quirófano en pacientesmayores de 12 anos. ˜ Rev Colomb Anestesiol. 2017;45:239–50.
6. .١Grunwell JR, Travers C, McCracken CE, Scherrer PD, Stormorken AG, Chumpitazi CE, et al. Procedural Sedation Outside of the Operating Room Using Ketamine in ٢٢،٦٤٥ Children: A Report From the Pediatric Sedation Research Consortium. Pediatr Crit Care Med. ٢٠١٦;١٧(١٢):١١٠٩–١٦.
7. Winterberg AV, Colella CL, Weber KA, Varughese AM. The Child Induction Behavioral Assessment Tool: A Tool to Facilitate the Electronic Documentation of Behavioral Responses to Anesthesia Inductions. J Perianesth Nurs. 2018 Jun;33(3):296-303.e1
8. Mayer S, Boyd J, Collins A, Kennedy MC, Fairbairn N, McNeil R. Characterizing fentanyl-related overdoses and implications for overdose response: Findings from a rapid ethnographic study in Vancouver, Canada. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2018 Dec 01;193:69-74.
9. Albin M, NIkodemski T. Always check anaesthetic equipment. Anaesthesiol Intensive Ther. 2018;50(1):85-86.
10. Roh WS, Kim DK, Jeon YH, Kim SH, Lee SC, Ko YK, et al. Analysis of anesthesia-related medical disputes in the 2009-2014 period using the Korean Society of Anesthesiologists database. J Korean Med Sci. 2015;30:207–213.
11. J.J. Vargo, P.J. Niklewski, J.L. Williams, J.F. Martin, D.O. Faigel. Patient safety during sedation by anesthesia professionals during routine upper endoscopy and colonoscopy: an analysis of 1.38 million procedures. Gastrointest Endosc, 85 (2017), pp. 101-108
12. A.M. Rubiano-Pinzón, C.C. Burbano-Paredes, Á.C. Hernández-Caicedo, D.A. Rincón-Valenzuela, C.A. Benavides-Caro, S. Restrepo-Palacio, et al. Currículo para la administración de sedación fuera del quirófano en pacientes mayores de 12 años. Rev Colomb Anestesiol, 45 (2017), pp. 239-250
13. Miller KA, Andolfatto G, Miner JR, Burton JH, Krauss BS: Clinical practice guideline for emergency department procedural sedation with propofol: 2018 update. Ann Emerg Med 73: 470, 2019. [PMID: 25544732
14. Miner JR, Driver BE, Moore JC, et al: Randomized clinical trial of propofol versus alfentanil for moderate procedural sedation in the emergency department. Am J Emerg Med 35: 1451, 2017. [PMID: 28438447]
15. Buhre W, Disma N, Hendrickx J, et al: European Society of Anaesthesiology Task Forceon Nitrous Oxide: a narrative review of its role in clinical practice. Br J Anaesth 122: 587, ٢٠١٩. [PMID: ٣٠٩١٦٠١١]
16. Green SM, Roback MG, Krauss BS, et al: Unscheduled procedural sedation: a multidisci-plinary consensus practice guideline. Ann Emerg Med 73: e51, 2019. [PMID: 31029297]
17. Barends CR, Absalom A, van Minnen B, Vissink A, Visser A: Dexmedetomidine versus midazolam in procedural sedation. A systematic review of efficacy and safety. PLoS One ١٢: e٠١٦٩٥٢٥, ٢٠١٧. [PMID: ٢٨١٠٧٣٧٣].
18. Aminiahidashti H, Shafiee S, Hosseininejad SM, et al: Propofol-fentanyl versus propofol-ketamine for procedural sedation and analgesia in patients with trauma. Am J EmergMed 36: 1766, 2018. [PMID: 29397258]
19. ١٥ Morgan L, McKeever TM, Nightingale J, Deakin DE, Moppett IK. Spinal or general anaesthesia for surgical repair of hip fracture and subsequent risk of mortality and morbidity: a database analysis using propensity score-matching. Anaesthesia ٢٠٢٠;٧٥:١١٧٣-٩.
20. ١٦ Neuman MD, Feng R, Carson JL, Gaskins L, Dillane D, Sessler DI, Sieber F, Magaziner J, Marcantonio ER, Mehta S, et al. Spinal anesthesia or general anesthesia for hip surgery in older adults. N Engl J Med ٢٠٢١;٣٨٥:٢٠٢٥-٣٥.
21. Boggs S.D. Barnett S.R. Urman R.D. The future of nonoperating room anesthesia in the 21st century: emphasis on quality and safety. Curr Opin Anaesthesiol. 2017; 30: 644-651
22. Choi J.W. Kim D.K.. Lee S.H.. Shin H.S. Seong B.G. Comparison of safety profiles between non-operating room anesthesia and operating room anesthesia: a study of 199,764 cases at a Korean tertiary hospital. J Kor Med Sci. 2018; 33: e183
23. Wong T. Georgiadis P.L. Urman R.D. Tsai M.H. Non-operating room anesthesia: patient selection and special considerations. Local Reg Anesth. 2020; 13: 1-9