

Dental Treatment Under Sedation Versus General Anesthesia

Zubaida Al Karaawi*

Prince Sultan Medical Military City, Riyadh, KSA

***Corresponding Author:** Zubaida Al Karaawi, Prince Sultan Medical Military City, Riyadh, KSA.

Received: December 21, 2018; **Published:** February 15, 2019

Abstract

The prevalence of dental caries among Saudi children is greater than 80%. Many of these children attend dental office only if they have dental pain or dental abscess that makes treatment on dental chair is challenging for the dentist. Dental treatment for un-cooperative children can be achieved under sedation or under general anesthesia (GA). In Prince Sultan Military Medical City (PSMMC), both forms of treatment are implemented at the day case surgery for healthy children. The criteria for selecting sedation versus GA depends on type and length of the procedure. Short procedure such as simple fillings or extractions can be performed under moderate sedation with single or multiple sedative drugs while longer procedure is completed under GA. Both sedation and GA are provided by anesthesiologist. The preference of either procedure is variable. While parents or guardians favor sedation to avoid GA and its consequences, the anesthesiologists prefer GA as it is easier to monitor patients vital signs and in maintaining safe airway. Dentists are more comfortable to perform dental treatment under GA. Stress is less as sedated patients are usually cry, move a lot and there is a possible risk of foreign body inhalation. In conclusion, dental treatment under sedation is not always successful. However, it did not show any serious complications. Therefore, its application must be limited to selected cases. Treatment under GA is favorable for both dentists and anesthesiologists but it is not an alternative to dental treatment on dental chair with behavior management.

Keywords: *Dental Treatment; Sedation; General Anesthesia*

Introduction

Behavioral control of pediatric or developmental delay individuals is one of the most important factors to be considered during dental treatment. When it is difficult to obtain patient co-operation by using conventional methods of behavior management, an alternative methods, such as administration of conscious sedation (CS) or general anesthesia (GA) are implemented. The prevalence of dental caries among Saudi children is greater than 80%. Many of these children attend dental office only if they have dental pain or dental abscess that makes treatment on the dental chair is challenging for the dentist. Therefore, these children are referred for dental treatment under CS, or GA in a hospital setting. However, sedation in dentistry is a controversial subject as a safe practice in dentistry. Although diversity of sedation methods in dental treatments are available, the most appropriate CS method and the achievability of sedation methods in dentistry have yet to be determined. In general, very young children and those with developmental/ intellectual delay require deep level of sedation to control their behavior during the procedure [1]. Nevertheless, it is not uncommon to shift from the intended level of sedation to a deep sedation. Therefore, all sedation providers must have sufficient skills to recognize the various levels of sedation and able to provide appropriate cardiopulmonary support if necessary [1]. Usually, in Saudi Arabia, CS in pediatric dentistry is only delivered to healthy children ASA I and occasionally to ASA II in hospital setting by the anesthesiologists whereas patients with underlying medical conditions and those with developmental delay, have their treatment completed under GA.

Aim of the Study

The aim of the present study was to evaluate satisfaction of pediatric dentists, anesthesiologists, and parents/Guardians when dental treatment is carried out under CS versus GA in pediatric patients.

Patients and Methods

117 children were not known to have any medical problems (ASA 1) attended pediatric dental clinic at PSMC in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. All patients were un-cooperative or very young who refused to receive dental treatment with behavioral management and local anesthesia. Age of patients range between 2.5 to 12 (mean age 6) years. Sixty one of the cases were males and 56 were females. An alternative methods such as treatment under CS or GA to control their behavior were offered to the parents/ guardians. Once the decision was made to refer the child for dental treatment under CS or GA, the type and action of either method was explained carefully to the parents /guardians; this includes indication and contra-indication with possible consequences of each type of treatment. The parents signed written consent for the procedure.

Physical assessment and vital signs of the patients are checked carefully. Oral examination and oral radiographs (whenever possible) were obtained. Initial dental treatment plan was discussed with the parents. All patients who need long dental procedures were referred for full dental rehabilitation under GA while those who require short procedures such as few dental fillings or extractions of primary teeth were referred for dental treatment under CS. Blood extraction for full blood screening is done for all patients. Physical assessment was completed by the anesthesia physician to approve or disapprove the case according to the general health condition of each patient.

All patients received dental treatment in the day case surgery where GA or CS was administered only by the anesthesiologists. All sedation children had IV line for drug administration (even those who received oral medication such as midazolam, an IV cannula was placed for immediate interaction if necessary) (Figure 1). Fasting time was the same (6 - 8 hours) for both groups. Most of the sedative drugs were cocktail of midazolam with ketamine, or midazolam with propofol. Some children had sevoflurane with oxygen for induction of CS to insert cannula in needle phobic or screaming children (Figure 2). Papose was used in sedative patients to stabilize the patient and to prevent sudden movement (Figure 3).



Figure 1: IV cannula was administered for all patients treated under CS.



Figure 2: Sevoflurane is used for induction of the sedative drugs in a needle phobic, panic or very young children.




Figure 3: Papose was used to stabilize the patient during treatment in the sedated patients.

Rubber dam was used whenever possible in sedated patients to prevent aspiration of foreign body (Figure 4). Following completion of the treatment (both groups), patients rest in the recovery room with parents and being watched by the recovery nurses until the patient returns to a good level of consciousness. The two groups of patients were evaluated in terms of vital signs, duration of the treatment procedure, patient behavior, recovery time and comfort experienced by the dentists and the anesthesiologists.



Figure 4: Rubber dam application was useful during moderate sedation to avoid aspiration of foreign body.

Results

All patients who need long dental procedures received full dental rehabilitation under GA (68 patients) while patients who required short procedures (few dental fillings or extractions of primary teeth) received dental treatment under CS (49 patients).

Difficulties during treatment under CS were noted by the dentists and the anesthesiologists. Movements and crying were observed in most patients (65%) especially in procedures needs more time (approximately 12 minutes or more) to be completed. Nevertheless, older children were more difficult to control their behavior during sedation. However, there was no difference in behavior between males and females children. Obese children were treated only under GA to avoid overdose or apnea.

During dental procedure under sedation, some interruption has been noted in few cases such as vomiting during the procedure (3 cases). Those who vomited, during the procedure, their heads were turned to one side, the procedure was discontinued immediately (to prevent aspiration), and the patients were referred for treatment under GA. Furthermore, suction was in use for both groups, although, there were difficulties or struggling experienced in some patients of the sedation group to keep the airway reflex clear as all patients were treated in supine position. When the treating dentist experienced such difficulties, the anesthesiologists rushed the dentist to complete the procedure quickly. Moreover, the oxygen saturation level was slightly lower in the sedation group compared with the GA group.

Throat packs was placed in the patient’s pharynx before starting the procedure under GA. The pack protects the airways from aspiration of any debris and was removed immediately following completing the procedure before extubation to prevent obstruction of the airway.

There were three incidence of vomiting in the recovery area and flumazenil (benzodiazepine antagonist) was given twice for delay recovery in sedation group.

Dentists in sedation group were strained, uncomfortable and restless during implementation of dental treatment. They were aware of patient’s vital signs, looking at the patients eyes, face and body movement as well as getting worried about airway while in the GA group, they were concentrating on dental treatment while the anesthesiologists took care of the patients’ general vital signs.

Dentists and anesthesiologists did not experience nervousness associated with duration of the procedure during treatment under GA, and they managed to comfortably conduct the procedure whereas during CS, they were worried from any complications that may occur during the procedure and rushed to finish the treatment. A round 30% of the anesthesiologists refused to perform treatment under CS to pediatric dental patients to avoid any complications in the airway.

Children treated under CS or under GA were noted to be agitated on recovery. However, patients who were treated under GA experienced a calmer phase during recovery. Treatment outcome under CS vs GS is summarized in table 1.

	CS	GA
Pre-operative assessment	Same	Same
Procedure type/length	Short	Medium or long
Fasting time before procedure	6 - 8 hours	6 - 8 hours
Needs for Drug Antagonists	2 patients	0 patients
Complications	3 patients vomiting during the treatment and 2 post operatively	None
Dentist and anesthesiologists comfort	Uncomfortable and stressed out	Comfortable
Patient comfort in the recovery	More agitated	Less agitated
Quality of work	Less quality depends on patient behavior	High quality
Post-operative recovery time	2 - 3 hours	2 - 3 hours

Table 1: Outcome of dental treatment under CS vs GA.

Discussion

Indications for GA or CS in pediatric dentistry include patients with intellectual or developmental delay and children who are uncooperative, anxious and needle phobic. In the present study, the following issues were assessed to choose method of treatment under CS or under GA such as (1) duration and complexity of the procedures; (2) dentists and anesthesiologists comfort to treat children under sedation and (3) parents/guardians acceptance of either method.

Parents prefer oral sedation than GA, as it is reasonably safe, cheap, tolerated by patients and comfy for needle phobic patients. However, parental acceptance of dental treatment under GA has been increased in comparison to earlier studies [2]. It has been reported that most parents that completed questionnaire regarding their preoperative anxiety and perception and their preference of CS versus GA, they rated that sedation is more accepted and recommended for dental treatment than GA [3].

It has been reported that most parents that completed questionnaire regarding their preoperative anxiety and perception and their preference of CS versus GA, they rated that sedation is more accepted and recommended for dental treatment than GA [1]. In PSMMC, CS in pediatric dentistry is only provided and monitored by anesthesiologists for patient's safety. In addition, all dentists who provide dental treatment under CS were certified following passing examination in sedation and life support.

The present study has similar results to that reported by Silay, *et al* [4]. Dental cases that require multiple dental procedures, CS method was not effective and not an alternative way to GA. Patients with pre-existing medical conditions, young children and the elderly are at more risk with sedation as the balance in sedation can be easily shifted from CS to deep sedation [5,6]. As a consequences, this may lead to over-sedation and respiratory depression which may result in death or permanent neurologic damage. Therefore, sedation protocol for pediatric dental procedures other than nitrous oxide inhalation sedation in Saudi Arabia is similar to the UK guidelines for pediatric dentistry that recommend practicing sedation techniques by an anesthesiologist in a hospital setting [3].

Certainly, the quality of dental restorations have been affected by child behavior during sedation. Dentists were hasty to complete treatment under CS even by choosing less durable restorations when patients' controlling behavior was difficult.

In PSMMC, fasting time before administration of CS is the same as that recommended for GA. The reason behind long fasting time before CS because it is difficult to predict the exact depth of sedation (deep sedation) which may lead to loss airway reflexes that makes it necessary to intubate the patient.

Sevoflurane sedation can be useful in dental treatment for pediatric and disabled patients. However, its use can be limited for short procedures as in case of excessive sedation, airway management is required and this making sevoflurane sedation less advantageous for long procedures [7]. In the present study, sevoflurane has been used only for induction of CS in needle phobic patients. On the other hand, administration of nitrous oxide with oxygen as a sedative agent is commonly failed to sedate the patient to a degree required to complete dental procedure.

Cost of treatment under CS or GA is not a factor to be considered in this study as both types of treatment is provided for free for all military individuals and their families although multiple appointments required for treatment under CS is an important factor to be considered for parental time out of work or children out from school. It has been reported that if a child needed more than three CS appointments, the GA option offered cost savings over the CS treatment option [8].

Conclusion

Dental treatment under CS can be successful with little or no complications if the cases are well selected by qualified trained dentist. Treatment under GA is favorable than CS for both dentists and anesthesiologists but it is not an alternative to dental treatment on dental chair with behavior management. The present study did not look at long-term success rates of dental procedures under GA versus CS.

Bibliography

1. Lee H., *et al.* "Ethics Rounds: Death After Pediatric Dental Anesthesia: An Avoidable Tragedy?" *Pediatrics* 140.6 (2017): e20172370.
2. Eaton JJ., *et al.* "Attitudes of contemporary parents toward behavior management techniques used in pediatric dentistry". *Pediatric Dentistry* 27.2 (2005): 107-113.
3. Ashley PF., *et al.* "Sedation for dental treatment of children in the primary care sector (UK)". *British Dental Journal* 208.11 (2010): 522-523.
4. Silay E., *et al.* "Conscious sedation with midazolam for dental procedures be an alternative to general anesthesia?" *Nigerian Journal of Clinical Practice* 16.2 (2013): 211-215.
5. Murphy MS. "Sedation for invasive procedures in paediatrics". *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 77.4 (1997): 281-284.
6. Hosey MT. "Managing anxious children: the use of conscious sedation in paediatric dentistry". *International Journal of Paediatric Dentistry* 12.5 (2002): 359-372.
7. Gomes HS., *et al.* "Does sevoflurane add to outpatient procedural sedation in children? A randomised clinical trial". *BMC Pediatrics* 17 (2017): 86.
8. Lee JY., *et al.* "A cost analysis of treating pediatric dental patients using general anesthesia versus conscious sedation". *Anesthesia Progress* 48.3 (2001): 82-88.

Volume 18 Issue 3 March 2019

©All rights reserved by Zubaida Al Karaawi.