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Abstract

Pharmacological management of the pediatric dental patient is considered a subcategory of a broader collection of professional mediated activities known as behavior management techniques. Pharmacological techniques are generally divided into either: (1) various levels of sedation; or (2) general anesthesia. Pharmacological techniques are not universally offered by practicing dentists for a host of reasons including, but not limited to: (1) variation in practitioner training and philosophy; (2) state rules and regulations; (3) cost and reimbursement; and (4) safety issues. (Pediatr Dent. 2004;26:131-136)
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For the parent who never suffered the ravages of carious lesions as a child, the acceptance of patient management techniques—beyond simple communication for the treatment of his/her child in the dental operatory—may seem as disconcerting, as the child’s task of coping with the discomfort and painful consequences of the disease itself. Yet, today’s discussions are focused on behavior management techniques and their implications for those who treat child dental disease as well as society, which demands that such treatment be performed efficiently and humanely.

Behavior management techniques are numerous, sometimes controversial, and likely as varied in terms of style of delivery as the number of practitioners who use the techniques. Furthermore, the extremes in types and configurations of preference of techniques available for managing the child patient are likely as diverse as the training programs that teach their use. However, at least one behavior management technique category consistently taught, albeit in variable formats, is pharmacological management of the patient. It is also the most likely to cause potential long-term adverse outcomes.

Pharmacological management of pediatric dental patients can be divided broadly into 2 general categories: (1) sedation; and (2) general anesthesia (GA). Although the technical and pharmacological context of sedation and GA vary, each has its own merit in terms of meeting patient and professional needs. A review of the literature on behavior management techniques associated with pediatric dentistry indicates that the one technique which most articles are written about is sedation and, to a much lesser extent, GA. In fact, a Medline search involving sedation and children, including medical studies, yields several hundred articles.

In deciding whether to use pharmacological management, several prominent factors must be considered—each of which is intrinsically complex when considered in the context of the pediatric dental setting. Among some of these factors are:

1. the risks involved with pharmacological management compared to routine communicative techniques;
2. past safety record of pharmacological management;
3. extent of the patient’s dental needs;
4. practitioner training and experience, including the ability to “rescue” a child when significantly compromised;
5. extent of professional investment and support for the technique, influence of other professional organizations related to safety and guidelines;
6. monitoring;
7. cost and third-party payors;
8. venue issues (ie, office vs outpatient care facility);
9. parental expectations and societal changes;
10. nature of the child’s cognitive and emotional needs and personality, and
11. integration of these factors into an acceptable modus operandi embraced by the dental profession.
Sedation risks and safety

There are many risks involved with child sedation for dental procedures. Brain damage and death are the most dramatic and paralyzing outcomes for the patient, family, staff, and practitioner. These tragic consequences are caused primarily by respiratory and airway compromise in sedated children. Minor risks include vomiting, irrational and paradoxical behaviors, and extremes in physiological parameters (eg, sustained high heart rate in a lightly sedated toddler).

Any unhealthy child can be at significant risk for a sedative procedure. It is imperative that the child’s health history be reviewed critically and a physical examination completed, including examination of the airway. Depending on the child’s behavior, especially when disruptive and crying behaviors dominate, the airway examination can be misleading. Therefore, in addition to an airway examination, parents must be queried about the occurrence, frequency, and degree of snoring.

Other issues such as allergies, respiratory and cardiovascular risk factors, impaired metabolic and organ functions, and the psychosocial makeup of the child are always important to address and understand. To optimize favorable sedation outcomes, only healthy children or those with very minor conditions (eg, mild cerebral palsy) should be sedated.

The orofacial complex in humans is unique. Phylogenetic and ontogenetic evolution has been designed to keep physical threats away from one’s head and its surrounding “space.” Even psychological invasion of that space appears to cause significant stress. Hence, the practice of dentistry may have its own intrinsic stimuli that evoke avoidance mechanisms in adults and especially in children. Despite light levels of sedation, this human attribute may activate significant behavioral consequences.

Restorative dentistry is usually performed in the mouth with an aerosol water spray. The mouth is a part of the airway, and when it is being challenged by procedural steps, the airway is also challenged. If the patient’s ability to control the airway is impaired due to pharmacological override of routine airway reflexes (eg, swallowing), failure to compensate or protect those reflexes can result in more primitive reflexes such as laryngospasms. An unresolved and poorly managed laryngospasm can result in significant brain damage or death. Preventive and protective formats such as rubber dams are certainly indicated, especially in sedated patients. Nonetheless, rubber dams in children and some adults evoke feelings of suffocation. They can also aggravate a situation in which patients already feel their ability to mediate any sense of control of their environment is minimized.

Morbidity and mortality statistics related to sedation are difficult to obtain and put into a reasonable safety perspective. There is no doubt that sedation deaths involving children have occurred in the United States, but there is no evidence suggesting that any sedation death has occurred when the practitioners faithfully followed appropriate sedation guidelines and were within the limits of professional parameters of care.

Despite estimates promulgated by various authors, it is not possible to determine the safety record associated either with sedations nor GA involving children and dentistry. There are individual reports of morbidity and mortality and quasi meta-analyses of reports and cases that can provide clues about the number of adverse outcomes. When considered in the context of time over which these incidents occurred, however, the number of cases safely completed remains unknown. Even through a generous extrapolation technique applied to published data, one might conclude that somewhere between 100,000 and 250,000 sedations involving children and dentistry are done annually. This number would constitute the denominator upon which the reported adverse events can be placed.

Pharmacological management cost and reimbursement issues

Perhaps one of the most important issues affecting the choice of pharmacological behavior management is the cost and reimbursement for providing GA. Reimbursement for services includes:

1. dental procedures;
2. anesthesia costs; and
3. facilities fees, depending on whether the procedure is done in an outpatient care facility or hospital.

Representative costs of each category may range from $500 to $1,500 for dental care, $200 to $2,000 for anesthesia, and $10 to $30/minute for facility fees. Medicaid usually pays for the cost of GA, including the 3 categories mentioned; however, the reimbursement rate from Medicaid varies considerably from state to state and is often below a “break-even” rate for practitioners.

It is probably safe to say and generally recognized by the dental community that the majority of the insurance industry does not cover the cost of GA for dental procedures in children. Comparably, the cost of GA is covered for medical procedures that, like dentistry, can be performed under local anesthesia such as removal of a splinter, myringotomies, and removal of in-grown toenails. Although the number of cases per year associated with some minor surgery may be small, certainly myringotomies, tonsillectomies, and adenoidectomies are quite common and comparable to the numbers involving various lesions. A minority of states has statutory regulations mandating insurance coverage of GA for provision of dental care for children and the developmentally disabled. Nonetheless, some states do mandate stipulated coverage.

The justification for GA by the medical specialties is the same as that for the dental specialties—namely patient fear and anxiety associated with needles and potentially uncomfortable procedures. The medical specialists could easily use a papoose board or other immobilization technique to render care. Like dentistry, however, the likelihood of poorer procedural outcomes increases when immobilization techniques for uncooperative children are used. In fact, it may be unsafe. Yet, the insurance lobby
is strongly opposed to coverage of dental procedures. The reason seems directly related to cost containment. Dental caries is the most common chronic childhood disease, and, when it comes to cost vs screaming and a lesser quality in care delivery, cost is the winner.

Training issues and sedation as a pharmacological alternative
Sedation is a potential alternative to GA, which, like GA, has appropriate indications for use. Generally, sedation is less costly. Nonetheless and equivocally, the risk to the normal, healthy child may be increased—not due solely to the drugs, but to the training limitations of some practitioners and their adherence to sedation guidelines. In today’s pediatric dental training programs, the number of sedations done by each resident varies considerably. There is no definitive statistic or data to describe the distribution in the level of sedation taught across training programs, but indirect evidence would suggest lighter sedations (eg, use of midazolam) are administered more frequently than deep sedations. Because evidence does exist supporting the notion that clinicians generally practice techniques similar to how they were trained, it is not surprising that few practitioners report using deep sedation techniques.\(^{10}\) In general, dental students are not often taught how to manage patients under deep sedation, especially considering the adverse events that may manifest and require immediate intervention. Faculty are often not consistently trained and competent in handling the conditions of the deeply sedated patient and potential consequences of deep sedation.

In some situations, practitioners have been taught deep sedation or they feel the necessity to use it to address significant carious lesions in patients who are behaviorally difficult to manage. In other words, they have no other resources and feel the natural professional obligation to help the needy child who otherwise suffers dental pain and discomfort. Arguably, the consequences of an adverse reaction that cannot be handled by the practitioner in these circumstances becomes rationally minimized by the clinician, who has a false perception of competency in emergency scenarios. This perception is based on the belief that adverse events during deep sedation (eg, laryngospasms) are rare occurrences. Dentists often tell themselves “it has never happened to me” or “it won’t happen to me.” The perception is reinforced by the multitude of cases in which no adverse events occur or are reported—a testimonial to the physiological resiliency of the pharmacologically challenged child.

What happens, however, when the probability not only favors such an event, but the event actually occurs? The educational process and clinical experience breaks down as the responsiveness to and emphasis of patient rescue relies on the inappropriate notion of calling 911, which does not directly assist patients in their most life-threatening situations. Without satisfactory resolution of the adverse event, time becomes the enemy to the clinician and, more importantly, to the child’s life.

The solutions to this issue are:
1. more extensive and standardized training across programs, as encouraged by regulatory mandates of professional organizations and state agencies;
2. resolution of the financial and political issues associated with the use of GA; or
3. continuance of the status quo.

The author believes focusing on the solution involving GA, in the long run, is the best outcome for the profession and patient. If it has worked for medical surgical specialties, why not for the dental profession?

Professional issues
Several inter- and intraprofessional issues affecting the use of pharmacological management of pediatric patients have interfered with dentistry’s well-intended motives of rendering quality restorative treatment of caries lesions. Examples include subtle but distinct professional pressures, particularly by medical anesthesiologists for independence in the roles of the operator and anesthetist. Oral and maxillofacial surgeons and pediatric dentists have propagated this practice. Again, the reason for this continuance is probably embedded in financial considerations.

The extent of dental care often requires 2 or more sedation appointments because of the possibility and limitation associated with overdosing the patient with local anesthetics. The literature is very clear, however, that the cost of 2 or more sedations, when considered in terms of the quality of care delivered, is more than 1 GA procedure.

Medical professionals and the media occasionally have been most critical of the manner in which child dental patients are managed. As a result, some of our techniques—such as hand-over-mouth, voice control, and, in some instances, immobilization—have been alleged as inhumane and barbaric. Pediatric dentistry’s old and deeply engrained perception is that they are appropriate, primarily because pediatric dentists have no other options.

Even sedation techniques have drawn the scrutiny of our medical anesthesiology colleagues through television, committee, and publication media, including the American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry’s (AAPD) failure to use sedation guidelines consistent with medical anesthesiologists. Unfortunately, in many instances, these criticisms are made without full knowledge of their implications or, more often, without intimate knowledge of dental procedures and sedations.

For more than a decade, the American Academy of Pediatrics and the AAPD have not mutually agreed upon a set of sedation guidelines for children.\(^{49}\) Most of the stumbling blocks have involved a failure to directly communicate and understand each other’s position on certain issues. Sometimes the vitriolic innuendos are without the benefit of any firsthand experience of what actually happens during sedations. Arguably, the latter situation is due more to the inexperience of medical anesthesiologists with dental sedations rather than vice-versa.
Societal and parenting issues

Parents have slowly been changing their perceptions of professionals who care for their children over the last 2 or 3 decades, and are beginning to influence the professional’s ability to practice as they have in the past. Unfortunately, trust is no longer a ubiquitous and integral component of the relationship a parent has with the professional. The old concept of “in parentis loco” is lost in the pages of textbooks published a quarter of a century ago. The reasons for the change are many.

There has been a fine balance between the professional’s ability, desire, and need to act as a substitute parent and the professional duties and responsibilities associated with delivering dental care. Sometimes what a parent expects of the professional and the translation of the expectation into the reality of mediating appropriate professional care are at odds with one another in terms of physical, emotional, cognitive, and psychological factors of dental patients. As a simple, common example today, a parent may expect that a pediatric dentist can administer local anesthesia to a shy, difficult-to-manage toddler without the child crying because he/she is a “pediatric dentist.”

A recent survey sample of American Board of Pediatric Dentistry Diplomates on parenting and its effects on practice indicated that children’s behaviors have changed for the worse over the past decade or so. They report that children tend to cry and be more disruptive today than in the past. They assign some blame to parenting, divorce, and other societal factors. Thus, the likelihood of more assertive behavior management or the use of pharmacological management increasing seems reasonable over the coming decades. A recent survey of directors of accredited pediatric dentistry training programs who report a higher incidence of sedations occurring in their program in recent years supports this conclusion.

Conclusions

GA for a healthy, fearful child is extremely safe. The medical or dental anesthesiologist (or in some states, certified registered nurse anesthetists) usually provides the GA in the dentist’s private office, outpatient care facilities, or in a hospital. Some medical specialists are opposed to GA being administered outside an outpatient care facility or hospital primarily because of perceived inabilities to rescue a child in trouble; however, little evidence supporting such an opinion is available, and whatever evidence is used to sustain this opinion is fraught with questionable interpretations.

Pharmacological management of pediatric dental patients is an acceptable and desirable technique. There are many issues, both pro and con, that influence the direction of development of a philosophy of pharmacological management of children for dental procedures universally accepted in medical, dental, business, and societal communities.

To begin a movement toward such a philosophy, a well-defined approach and initiative need to be mounted. The goals and objectives that must be minimally included are:

1. a series of comprehensive, well-controlled, and parametric research endeavors associated with pharmacological patient management aimed at the development of a clinical science of safety and efficiency;
2. dissemination of current and future knowledge to a host of communities of interest concerning pharmacological management as an acceptable and desirable behavior management technique;
3. collaboration among medical and dental organizations in the pursuit of safe, reliable, and mutually acceptable guidelines;
4. political and business initiatives designed to address cost containment; and
5. development and implementation of a set of measurable, personal, and societal-contingent responsibilities designed to minimize dental disease and maximize its management.

This philosophy will necessitate time, strategic planning, and an embodiment of courage, desire, faith, perseverance, and indefatigable energies for success to occur and for children to be free of the pain, fear, and anxiety associated with oral health.
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