The significance of neuromonitoring for critically ill patients.

Grettina Keller*

Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Lausanne, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

Introduction

As a result of primary neurological problems or secondary insults, critically sick individuals are frequently at risk of neurological dysfunction. Determining which aspects of brain function are affected and how to best manage neurological dysfunction can be difficult. This is made more difficult by the limited information available from clinical examination in such patients and the effects of therapies, particularly sedation, on neurological function. In recent years, methods for measuring and monitoring brain function have advanced significantly, and they now play a critical role in the evaluation and management of patients with brain injuries. Importantly, no single technique is appropriate for all patients, and different variables will need to be monitored in different patients; in many cases, a combination of monitoring strategies will be necessary [1]. Neuromonitoring's overall goals are to: 1) identify worsening neurological function and secondary cerebral insults that may benefit from specific treatment(s); 2) improve pathophysiological understanding of cerebral disease in critical illness; 3) provide clear physiological data to guide and individualise therapy; and 4) aid in prognostication. In this post, we'll go over the neuromonitoring techniques that are currently being used in critically ill patients, as well as how they should be used to assist us better care for them. We'll concentrate on strategies that are already in use in the clinic, rather than discussing novel approaches that are still in the research stage.

A single monitoring technique may not properly capture the complicated pathophysiological changes in the brain and the notion of multimodality monitoring, the simultaneous digital recording of numerous aspects of brain function, has been presented. Multicenter partnerships like Brain IT (Brain monitoring with Information Technology collaborative network) have shown that recording numerous physiological data across different patients is possible and can bring novel clinical insights. Advanced statistical and mathematical methods can be used to analyse vast amounts of data in order to uncover patterns of brain injury and make it easier for physicians to pinpoint specific targets [2-4]. Data integration and synchronisation challenges remain, but in the end, this approach should give real-time, user-friendly advanced data analysis that, when used at the enterprise level, should enable real-time, user-friendly advanced data analysis. Although clinical investigations demonstrate the physiological viability of this approach, no published data from randomised trials to support that targeting any variables improves clinical outcome has been reported in the last 25 years. Over the last 20 years, neurocritical care research has centred on the possibility that early pharmacological intervention could improve outcome, diverting attention away from trials designed to answer simple questions about the day-to-day management of acute brain injury patients, such as optimum haemoglobin transfusion thresholds, hyperventilation, and arterial pressure management after hemorrhagic stroke, for example. More widespread availability and use of neuromonitoring technology should make it easier to build large clinical trial networks with the requisite infrastructure [5,6].

Brain function monitoring in critically ill patients must begin with a thorough clinical examination. Monitoring systems often look at single variables, so there's a need to integrate/combine systems to provide a complete and accurate picture of the patient's state so that the best treatment may be chosen. Importantly, neuromonitoring is a continuous process rather than a single measurement; the capacity to track changes over time is critical for assessing therapy response and predicting prognosis. No monitor will enhance patient outcomes on its own, but careful data interpretation and integration into a tailored therapy plan should help optimise care for critically sick patients with brain injury.

References

1. Teasdale G, Jennett B. Assessment of coma and impaired consciousness: A practical scale. Lancet. 1974;304(7872):81-4.
2. Ely EW, Margolin R, Francis J, et al. Evaluation of delirium in critically ill patients: Validation of the Confusion Assessment Method for the Intensive Care Unit (CAM-ICU). Crit Care Med. 2001;29(7):1370-9.
3. Pickard JD, Czosnyka M. Management of raised intracranial pressure. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 1993;56(8):845-58.
4. Washington CW, Zipfel GJ. Detection and monitoring of vasospasm and delayed cerebral ischemia: A review and assessment of the literature. J Neurocrit Care. 2011;15(2):312-7.

***Correspondence to:** Grettina Keller, Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Lausanne, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland, E-mail: keller@unil.ch

***Received:** 25-Jan-2022, Manuscript No. AAICCN-22-103; **Editor assigned:** 27-Jan-2022, PreQC No. AAICCN-22-103(PQ); **Reviewed:** 10-Feb-2022, QC No. AAICCN-22-103; **Revised:** 15-Feb-2022, Manuscript No. AAICCN-22-103(R) ; **Published:** 22-Feb-2022, DOI:10.35841/aaiccn-5.1.103*

***Citation:** Keller G. The significance of neuromonitoring for critically ill patients. J Intensive Crit Care Nurs. 2022;5(1):103*

5. De Backer D, Ospina-Tascon G, Salgado D, et al. Monitoring the microcirculation in the critically ill patient: current methods and future approaches. Intensive Care Med. 2010;36(11):1813-25.
6. Oddo M, Rossetti AO. Predicting neurological outcome after cardiac arrest. Curr Opin Crit Care. 2011;17: 254-9.

Citation: *Keller G. The significance of neuromonitoring for critically ill patients. J Intensive Crit Care Nurs. 2022;5(1):103*