



HAL
open science

French current practice for ambulatory anesthesia in children: a survey among the French-speaking Pediatric Anesthesiologists Association (ADARPEF)

Yves Nivoche, Mm Lucas-Polomeni, Souhayl Dahmani, Christopher John Brasher, Eric Wodey, Philippe Courrèges

► To cite this version:

Yves Nivoche, Mm Lucas-Polomeni, Souhayl Dahmani, Christopher John Brasher, Eric Wodey, et al.. French current practice for ambulatory anesthesia in children: a survey among the French-speaking Pediatric Anesthesiologists Association (ADARPEF). *Pediatric Anesthesia*, 2011, 21 (4), pp.379. 10.1111/j.1460-9592.2010.03507.x . hal-00606654

HAL Id: hal-00606654

<https://hal.science/hal-00606654>

Submitted on 7 Jul 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



French current practice for ambulatory anesthesia in children: a survey among the French-speaking Pediatric Anesthesiologists Association (ADARPEF)

Journal:	<i>Pediatric Anesthesia</i>
Manuscript ID:	PAN-2010-0293.R3
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Original Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Nov-2010
Complete List of Authors:	Nivoche, Yves; Hôpital Robert Debré, Service d'anesthésie réanimation Lucas-Polomeni, MM; Service d'Anesthésie-Réanimation Chirurgicale 2, Hôpital Pontchaillou Dahmani, Souhayl; Robert Debre Hospital, Anaesthesiology Brasher, Christopher; Robert Debré University Hospital, Anaesthesia Wodey, Eric; CHU Pontchaillou, Service d'Anesthésie Réanimation 2 Courrèges, Philippe; Hôpital Jeanne de Flandre, Pôle d'Anesthésie Réanimation
Key Words:	outpatient < Ambulatory, Audit, quality improvement < Outcomes, children, pediatric anesthesia, Ambulatory



EW

1
2 **French current practice for ambulatory anesthesia in children: a survey among the French-**
3
4 **speaking Pediatric Anesthesiologists Association (ADARPEF)**
5
6

7
8 Yves Nivoche MD¹, Marie-Madeleine Lucas MD², Souhayl Dahmani MD¹, Christopher Brasher
9
10 MD¹, Eric Wodey MD², Philippe Courrèges MD³, French-speaking Pediatric Anesthesiologists
11
12 Association (ADARPEF)
13
14

15
16 ¹Service d'Anesthésie Réanimation et de traitement de la douleur, Hôpital Robert Debré, Paris
17

18 ²Service d'Anesthésie Réanimation II, Hôpital Anne de Bretagne, Rennes
19

20 ³Pôle d'Anesthésie Réanimation, Hôpital Jeanne de Flandre, Lille
21
22

23
24 *Correspondence to* : ADARPEF, Dr Philippe Courrèges ,1417, rue Bataille 62840 Sailly sur la Lys,
25
26 France e-mail: npcourreges@free.fr
27
28

29
30 **Running title** : Outpatient anesthesia
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Background: This survey aims to describe current practice in ambulatory care among pediatric anesthesiologists in France.

Methods: Members of the French-speaking Pediatric Anesthesiologists Association (ADARPEF) were sent a questionnaire examining the proportion of pediatric ambulatory anesthesia practiced by each responder, the level of adherence to pediatric ambulatory anesthesia guidelines, and responder consensus in decision making when faced with common case scenarios in pediatric ambulatory anesthesia. For the latter, consensus was defined as a >80 % opinion.

Results: 145 pediatric anesthesiologists replied (43%). Ambulatory anesthesia appears underused in France. Recent French pediatric ambulatory anesthesia guidelines are being applied. Post operative pain is poorly managed. The choice of scheduling children for ambulatory anesthesia appears to be more heavily influenced by practitioners' subjective evaluation than evidence from the literature.

Conclusion: A better commitment for ambulatory care must be found amongst anesthesiologists. Further studies are required to improve coherence, safety and efficiency of children selection for ambulatory anesthesia.

Key-words: children, pediatric anesthesia, outpatient procedures, ambulatory

Introduction

Ambulatory pediatric anesthesia has substantial benefits over inpatient anesthesia, provided care is high quality and patient selection is appropriate. In 2008, experts from National Council of Pediatric Surgery (Conseil national de Chirurgie de l'Enfant : CNCE) and from the French-speaking Pediatric Anesthesiologists Association (Association des Anesthésistes Réanimateurs Pédiatriques d'Expression Française : ADARPEF) conjointly examined updated data on ambulatory pediatric surgery. Quality and safety guidelines regarding good anesthetic practice in patients aged < 18 years scheduled for ambulatory procedures were drafted from the data. The guideline recommendations related to issues around having dedicated ambulatory care units, specific medical skills, patient selection and peri-operative management. These guidelines were field tested in a limited number of hospitals, approved by the CNCE and ADARPEF, officially adopted by the French Ministry of Health, and published electronically on both institutions' websites in May 2009 (1; 2). The guidelines defined ambulatory anesthesia as "every mode of planned anesthesia given by an anesthesiologist during a stay < 1 day's duration".

Six months after e-publication, the ADARPEF performed a survey aiming to examine pediatric ambulatory anesthesia practice in France. The survey had two related aims: (i) determine the level of adherence to the above mentioned pediatric ambulatory anesthesia guidelines (ii) gather further information about what pediatric anesthesiologists thought were suitable cases for ambulatory anesthesia by eliciting clinician responses to theoretical case scenarios in pediatric ambulatory anesthesia.

Materials and Methods

In November 2009, 341 ADARPEF members, all of whom were practicing in France, were e-mailed a questionnaire that remained available on the ADARPEF web-site for a further month. Non-responding members were sent a reminder 15 days later.

The questionnaire was in 3 sections. The 1st (table 1) inquired the practitioners' seniority, the proportion of their anesthesia activity that was pediatric, and, for children aged < 18 years, their

1
2 annual number and percentage of cases that were performed in ambulatory mode. The type of
3
4 medical structure was defined (teaching/university, public, private, etc), as was the level of pediatric
5
6 activity, and the presence or absence of dedicated pediatric surgery and day care units.
7

8
9 The 2nd section (table 2) asked the lowest accepted age for ambulatory care, most commonly
10
11 performed ambulatory procedures, and descriptions of peri-anesthetic management.
12

13
14 The 3rd section (table 3) presented responders with 24 different pediatric anesthesia case-scenarios
15
16 drawn up by the ADARPEF Scientific Committee. Scenarios presented common ambulatory
17
18 procedures in children, with or without common or clinically important symptoms, illnesses, or pre-
19
20 existing co-morbidities. Symptoms and co-morbidities included asthma, diabetes mellitus,
21
22 malignant hyperthermia susceptibility, morbid obesity, obstructive sleep apnea (OSA), sickle-cell
23
24 disease, fever, signs of upper respiratory tract infection. Responders were asked for a yes/no
25
26 response as to suitability for ambulatory care for each scenario. An 80% majority opinion was
27
28 chosen as a consensus. A dedicated pediatric anesthesiologist was defined as one whose clinical
29
30 practice included more than 50% of patients < 18 years of age.
31
32
33

34 35 **Subjects studied**

36
37 Completed questionnaires were descriptively analyzed. Correlation between guidelines
38
39 recommendations, responders' medical structures and peri-operative management was assessed.
40
41 Responder consensus to proceed with ambulatory care for patients according to clinical case
42
43 scenarios was analyzed.
44
45

46 47 **Results** (tables 1, 2, 3)

48
49 Only 145 of 341 members (43%) replied over the one month period. All were included in analysis.

50
51 Only 42 of a total of 3480 questions were left unanswered (1%).
52

53
54 Almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of responders (72%) were experienced pediatric anesthesiologists according to the study
55
56 definition. Almost $\frac{1}{2}$ (47%) practiced exclusively in pediatrics, predominantly in
57
58 university/teaching hospitals. Ambulatory anesthesia represented around $\frac{1}{3}$ of overall clinical
59
60 practice and commonly involved imaging, endoscopic, orthopedic and ENT procedures. Over 90%

1
2 of responders reported practicing in structures with dedicated pediatric inpatient, pediatric surgery,
3
4 and ambulatory care units as recommended by the guidelines.
5

6
7 Almost 60% of responders worked in units that hold regular meetings to discuss the pertinence of
8
9 choices made between ambulatory and inpatient care in a selection of patients. This is
10
11 recommended by the guidelines. These meetings assess whether the type of care chosen
12
13 (ambulatory or hospitalization) was adapted to each patient given age, pathology and type of
14
15 procedure. The aim is to improve future admission selection. Further, in accordance with the
16
17 guidelines, 6 months was the predominant lowest acceptable age for ambulatory care in 43% of
18
19 responders, and the majority of parents were given documentation describing the peri-operative
20
21 period. A minority of responders (25%) prescribed systematic anticipatory analgesia, and 1/3
22
23 prescribed rescue analgesia.
24
25
26

27
28 Only 42% of case scenarios resulted in consensus for proceeding with or deciding against
29
30 ambulatory care. One third resulted in 40 to 60% agreement - a strong lack of consensus.
31
32

33 Discussion

34
35 The results must be discussed in the light of the survey's limits: (i) most responders work
36
37 predominantly in teaching/university hospitals, unrepresentative of the French ambulatory pediatric
38
39 anesthesia as a whole, which is mainly ENT procedures in private clinics; (ii) the responder rate is
40
41 low; this may be due partly to indifference for ambulatory mode, partly to the short survey duration,
42
43 and partly to dedicated member practice in fields unconcerned by ambulatory pediatric anesthesia
44
45 (Neurosurgery, Cardiac Surgery, Critical Care, Pain Medicine); (iii) case scenario descriptions were
46
47 limited to yes/no responses which facilitated analysis but excluded many variables; (iv) socio-
48
49 familial or discharge criteria were not explored. Despite these weaknesses, the results described in
50
51 this study probably do reflect pediatric anesthesiologists' practice in France.
52
53
54

55
56 Despite the advantages of ambulatory anesthesia for children, ambulatory care is underutilized in
57
58 France. The overall ambulatory rate is lower than the $\geq 50\%$ reported from many other countries (3-
59
60 5). Children are generally well suited to ambulatory anesthesia, given the disturbance that

1
2 hospitalization represents to them, and the relatively benign nature of many pediatric surgical
3
4 procedures (6). With well managed pediatric ambulatory care, demonstrating expertise and building
5
6 patient and parent confidence, more complex patients can also be managed in an ambulatory setting.
7
8 Consequently, ambulatory care should be the preferred choice in children, and physicians should
9
10 have to justify overnight hospitalization.
11
12

13
14 The main findings of the study were that most responders respect CNCE/ADARPEF guideline
15
16 recommendations in terms of care structures, parent information and review of ambulatory care.
17
18 Broadest agreement for a minimum age of pediatric ambulatory anesthesia also corresponds with
19
20 guidelines. Low prescription rates of discharge analgesics are a major concern, previously reported
21
22 elsewhere (4; 7). Subsequent fear of inadequate analgesia felt by children or parents may even
23
24 reduce acceptance of ambulatory care.
25
26

27
28 Compared to other similar studies, the consensus rates to case scenarios asking whether patients
29
30 were suitable for ambulatory care were low, although higher than in a similar Canadian study of 64
31
32 responders (8). One reason may be that the definition of an 80% majority opinion as consensus was
33
34 more severe than the 65% used by the ASA, the 70% used in the Canadian study, and the 75% used
35
36 in other surveys (9). To give an informed yes or no answer as to the appropriateness of ambulatory
37
38 care, responders needed to be knowledgeable about the anesthetic complications of the pathologies
39
40 described in case scenarios, and to allow for patient age and type of procedure. They also needed to
41
42 know whether complications were likely to be immediate or delayed, the latter invoking caution.
43
44

45
46 Case scenarios responses indicate that practitioners are more likely to decide upon ambulatory care
47
48 subjectively rather than using evidence in the literature. For instance, the fact that diabetes mellitus
49
50 is not a predictor of increased morbidity in pediatric anesthesia, provided that peri-operative fasting
51
52 is reduced (10; 11), does not seem well known. There seems little other explanation for the
53
54 incoherence of results in two case scenarios involving diabetes mellitus with consensus for
55
56 ambulatory care in a diabetic child scheduled for inguinal hernia repair, but complete lack of
57
58 consensus for the simpler myringotomy and tube placement. Similar conclusions may be drawn as
59
60

1
2 to lack of knowledge regarding the fact that ambulatory anesthesia does not increase the risk of
3
4 developing a malignant hyperthermia in patients with malignant hyperthermia susceptibility (10-
5
6 12). The only consensus found in three scenarios involving malignant hyperthermia susceptibility
7
8 was that against ambulatory care in the context of fever of 38°C and strabismus repair, and the fever
9
10 may well have influenced the consensus against ambulatory care as much as malignant
11
12 hyperthermia susceptibility. Nor was there was consensus for ambulatory care in a scenario
13
14 involving isolated morbid obesity, despite the lack of evidence that it increases unanticipated
15
16 admission rates following ambulatory care in children, or that inpatient care improves outcomes.
17
18 This may be due to extrapolation of data describing predominantly respiratory peri-operative
19
20 complications in obese adults undergoing ambulatory anesthesia (10).
21
22
23
24

25
26 The survey did not identify consensus on the subject of fever, whether in isolation or associated
27
28 with co-morbidities. This is unsurprising as the literature is unhelpful on this subject. Similarly, no
29
30 consensus was found for children with active or recent upper respiratory tract infections. Although
31
32 increased peri-operative respiratory complications are observed in these contexts (13; 14), baseline
33
34 respiratory complication rates are low, uncommonly associated with serious morbidity (15) and
35
36 unaffected by the mode of anesthetic practices (16).
37
38
39

40
41 There was no consensus for or against ambulatory care for a toddler with OSA undergoing
42
43 circumcision. In contrast, OSA related morbidity in ENT patients seems well known, resulting in
44
45 consensus against ambulatory anesthesia. Indeed, OSA clearly increases peri-operative risk and
46
47 requires caution, particularly when associated with ENT surgery. OSA remains the most frequent
48
49 indication for unexpected readmission after tonsillectomy (17), although no increase in post
50
51 tonsillectomy complications has been demonstrated prospectively. A higher incidence of
52
53 postoperative respiratory complications requiring medical intervention has also been retrospectively
54
55 found in children with OSA aged < 2 years (18). Accordingly, the American Academy of Pediatrics
56
57 recommends inpatient mode for children with OSA aged < 36 months, and all children with severe
58
59 OSA (19), while the French Society of Anesthesia and Intensive Care (Société Française
60

1
2 d'Anesthésie et de Réanimation : SFAR) and the ADARPEF both recommend inpatient care for
3
4 tonsillectomies in children with severe OSA (20).

5
6
7 The recent literature on sickle-cell disease and pediatric ambulatory care is limited to 1 paper
8
9 claiming that specific high risk situations including anesthesia requires “adequate responses” (21).
10
11 Responders reported consensus against ambulatory anesthesia in a child with 58% HbS scheduled
12
13 for adeno-tonsillectomy & bilateral myringotomy and tube placement.

14
15
16 No consensus was found for cases involving isolated unclassified encephalopathy and minor
17
18 laparoscopic surgery in a toddler (the latter probably too uncommon given the patient's age). There
19
20 was however consensus to proceed with ambulatory anesthesia in scenarios involving aggressive
21
22 autism, Lowe's syndrome (a rare disease seemingly known to responders despite 7 non-responses),
23
24 and an adolescent given non-steroidal anti-inflammatories the day before an arthroscopy. Consensus
25
26 was also found against an asthmatic child having suffered an attack the day before adeno-
27
28 tonsillectomy.
29
30

31
32
33 In summary, although the literature is often unhelpful in deciding for or against ambulatory care,
34
35 pediatric anesthesiologists also seemed uninformed about the information that does exist. Despite
36
37 studies showing that peri-operative surgical complication rates are higher than those related to
38
39 previous medical conditions (22), lack of knowledge with respect to specific pathologies and their
40
41 impact upon risk in ambulatory anesthesia seems to hinder the employment and development of
42
43 ambulatory pediatric anesthesia. The findings from this section of the survey imply more education
44
45 is needed in determining suitability for pediatric ambulatory surgery. Although life-threatening
46
47 complications are rare in ambulatory pediatric anesthesia, indications for inpatient care should be
48
49 systematically reviewed using relevant journals, and cross-referenced with morbidity/mortality
50
51 studies in order to improve patient selection criteria and peri-operative management and reduce
52
53 unnecessary hospitalizations. However, although there is room for education for cases where there
54
55 is good evidence, the majority of non-consensual scenarios involved situations for which the
56
57 literature is ambiguous implying opinions vary and thus it would be inappropriate to proscribe
58
59
60

1
2 practice in these situations. In these scenarios, further studies are required in the field of pertinent
3 complications, their incidence, and associated risk factors.
4

5
6 Fear of ambulatory care planning failure seems to negatively influence care providers. Failure and
7 cancellation have consequences, including the economic and emotional impact upon children and
8 parents (23), surgical team underemployment, and futile administrative effort. A balance needs to
9 be found, maximizing the use of ambulatory care for appropriate patients, while scheduling
10 inpatient care for patients with risk factors for complications requiring hospitalization, thus
11 avoiding the costs and stress associated with unplanned admissions.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Conclusion**

21 Despite its limits, this survey reveals that ADARPEF members practicing in France: (i) in general
22 follow French CNCE/ADARPEF guideline recommendations, but, (ii) do not sufficiently use
23 ambulatory anesthesia in children, (iii) prescribe post-operative analgesics poorly, and (iv)
24 generally demonstrate lack of consensus as to the appropriateness of ambulatory care in common
25 clinical situations.
26
27

28 More information must be provided to pediatric anesthetists to improve the quality and use of
29 ambulatory pediatric anesthesia.
30
31
32
33

34 **References**

- 35 1. Léculée R, Courrèges P. À propos des recommandations du Conseil National de la Chirurgie
36 de l'Enfant (CNCE) et de l'ADARPEF sur la chirurgie ambulatoire de l'enfant de moins de
37 18 ans. *Ann Fr Anesth Reanim* 2010; 29: 552-3
38
- 39 2. Léculée R, Courrèges P. Chirurgie ambulatoire de l'enfant de moins de 18 ans :
40 recommandations. *Arch Pediatr* 2010; 17: 844-5
41
- 42 3. De Lathouwer C, Poullier JP. How much ambulatory surgery in the World in 1996-1997 and
43 trends? *Ambul Surg*. 2000; 18: 191-210
44
- 45 4. Segerdahl M, Warrén-Stomberg M, Rawal N et al. Children in day surgery: clinical practice
46 and routines. The results from a nation-wide survey. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2008; 52:821-
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2 8
3
4
5 5. Rabbitts JA, Groenewald CB, Moriarty JP et al. Epidemiology of Ambulatory Anesthesia
6
7 for Children in the United States: 2006 and 1996. Under publication. *Anesth Analg* 2010
8
9
10 6. SFAR. Recommandations formalisées d'experts. Prise en charge anesthésique des patients
11
12 en hospitalisation ambulatoire. *Ann Fr Anesth Reanim.* 2010; 29: 67-72
13
14 7. Fortier M, MacLaren JE, Martin SR et al. Paediatric pain after ambulatory surgery: where's
15
16 the medication? *Paediatrics* 2009; 124: 588-95
17
18 8. Abu-Shahwan I. Ambulatory anaesthesia and the lack of consensus among Canadian
19
20 paediatric anaesthetists: a survey. *Paed Anaesth* 2007; 17: 223-9
21
22 9. Silverstein JH, Apfelbaum JL, Barlow JC et al. Practice guidelines for postanesthetic care. A
23
24 report by the American Society of Anesthesiology Task Force on postanesthetic care.
25
26 *Anesthesiology* 2002; 96: 742-52
27
28
29 10. Bryson GL, Chung F, Cox RG, et al. Canadian Ambulatory Anaesthesia Research Education
30
31 group. Patient selection in ambulatory anaesthesia - an evidence-based review: part II. *Can J*
32
33 *Anaesth.* 2004; 51: 782-94
34
35
36 11. Chung F, Mezei G, Tong D. Pre-existing medical conditions as predictors of adverse events
37
38 in day-case surgery. *Br J Anaesth* 1999; 83: 262-70
39
40
41 12. Yentis SM, Levine MF, Hartley EJ. Should all children with suspected or confirmed
42
43 malignant hyperthermia susceptibility be admitted after surgery? A 10 year review. *Anesth*
44
45 *Analg* 1992; 75: 345-50
46
47
48 13. Tait AR, Malviya S, Voepel-Lewis T et al. Risk factors for perioperative adverse respiratory
49
50 events in children with upper respiratory tract infections. *Anesthesiology* 2001; 95: 299- 306
51
52
53 14. von Ungern-Sternberg BS, Boda K, Chambers NA et al. Risk assessment for respiratory
54
55 complications in paediatric anaesthesia: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet.* 2010 4; 376:
56
57 773-83
58
59
60 15. Jimenez N, Posner KL, Cheney FW, Caplan RA et al. An update on pediatric anesthesia

- 1
2 liability: a closed claims analysis. *Anesth Analg.* 2007; 104: 147-53
3
4
5 16. Warner DO, Warner MA, Barnes RD et al. Perioperative respiratory complications in
6
7 patients with asthma. *Anesthesiology* 1996; 85: 460-7
8
9 17. American Thoracic Society. Cardiorespiratory sleep studies in children: establishment of
10
11 normative data and polysomnography predictors of morbidity. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*
12
13 1999; 160: 1381-7
14
15
16 18. Wilson K, Lakheeram I, Morielli A et al. Can assessment for obstructive sleep apnea help
17
18 predict posttonsillectomy respiratory complications? *Anesthesiology* 2002; 96: 313-22
19
20
21 19. American academy of paediatrics. Clinical practice guideline: diagnosis and management of
22
23 childhood obstructive sleep apnea syndrome. *Paediatrics* 2002; 109: 704-12
24
25
26 20. Orliaguet G. Anaesthesia for tonsillectomy in children. *Ann Fr Anesth Reanim.* 2008; 273:
27
28 200-1
29
30 21. Marchant WA, Walker I. Anaesthetic management of the child with sickle cell disease.
31
32 *Paediatr Anaesth.* 2003; 13: 473-89
33
34
35 22. Lermite J, Chung F. Patient selection in ambulatory surgery. *Curr Opin Anaesthesiol.* 2005;
36
37 18: 598-602
38
39
40 23. Tait AR, Voepel-Lewis T, Munro HM et al. Cancellation of pediatric outpatient surgery:
41
42 economic and emotional implications for patients and their families. *J Clin Anesth.* 1997; 9:
43
44 213-9
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Practitioner details (no unanswered questions in all 145 responses; bold characters = majority)

ADARPEF members	92%	
Years of pediatric anesthesia practice (mean \pm SD)	15 \pm 2	
N° of children < 18 yo. anesthetized / yr (mean \pm SD)	742 \pm 103	
% of practice in children	100%	47%
	>50%	25%
	<50%	25%
	occasional	3%
Children outpatient % rate	0-10 %	4%
	10 -25%	9%
	25- 50%	32%
	50-75%	27%
	75- 100%	8%
Employing medical structure	University	59%
	General	17%
	Private hospital	9%
	Private clinic	15%
Identified pediatric inpatient unit (Yes)	92%	
Identified pediatric surgery unit (Yes)	96%	
Identified day-care unit (Yes)	92%	

For Peer Review

Table 2: Anesthetic practice (1 responder did not answer the routine ambulatory procedure question; bold characters = majority)

Regular meetings for retrospective analysis of hospitalization modes	Yes	58
	No	17%
	Unknown	25%
Lowest age for routine ambulatory care	<1 mo	4%
	1mo	4%
	6mo	43%
	6mo-1yr	19%
	> 1yr	13.%
	Other	17%
Routine ambulatory procedures	Diagnostic (RMI, endoscopy...)	85%
	Visceral	76%
	Urology	85%
	Orthopedics	83%
	Cosmetics	65%
	Tonsillectomy	31%
	Adenoidectomy	78%
	Myringotomy + tube	79%
Others	26%	
Preoperative written information	Yes	90%
	No	10%
Anticipated analgesic prescription	Yes	25%
	No	75%
Rescue analgesic prescription	Yes	36%
	No	65%

For Peer Review

Table 3: Case scenarios (*bold characters = consensus*)

Age	Pre-existing Disease			Procedure	Yes	No	Unanswered (n)
15 yr	Aggressive autism	-	-	RMI	97 %	3%	0
7 yr	Lowe's syndrome	-	-	Ocular examination	84%	16%	7
5 yr	Diabetes mellitus	-	-	Inguinal hernia repair	90%	10%	1
14 yr	Sickle cell disease (HbS 58%)	-	-	Adeno-tonsillectomy+bilat. myringotomy/tube	12%	88%	1
13 yr	OSA	-	-	Adeno-tonsillectomy	14%	86%	2
12 yr	Morbid obesity	-	-	Bilat. myringotomy/tube	74%	26%	1
17 yr	Diabetes mellitus	-	-	Bilat. myringotomy/tube	49%	51%	2
5 yr	Unclassified encephalopathy	-	-	Endoscopic gastrostomy	45%	55%	1
2 yr	OSA	-	-	Circumcision	41%	59%	3
18 mo	Malignant hyperthermia susceptibility	-	-	Bilat. myringotomy/tube	49%	51%	1
Symptoms & specific situations, without pre-existing co-morbidity							
Age	Symptoms & Situations	Fever	Rhinorrhoea	Procedure	Yes	No	Unanswered (n)
12yr	Non-steroidal day before	No	No	Knee arthroscopy	88%	12%	1
5 yr	None	38°c	Purulent	Adeno-tonsillectomy+bilat. myringotomy/tube	11%	89%	2
5 yr	Asthma crisis the day before	No	No	Adeno-tonsillectomy	9%	91%	2
12 yr	None	No	No	Laparoscopic orchidopexy	77%	23%	3
1yr	Killed vaccine 3 days ago	38°c	No	Urological endoscopy	54%	46%	4
1yr	None	38°c	No	Myringotomy/tube	70%	30%	1
11 mo	None	38°c	Clear	Inguinal hernia repair	49%	51%	1
7 mo	None	38°c	No	Inguinal hernia repair	45%	55%	2
Symptoms combined with pre-existing co-morbidity							
Age	Pre-existing Disease	Fever	Rhinorrhoea	Procedure	Yes	No	Unanswered (n)
3 yr	Asthma	No	Clear	Inguinal hernia repair	92%	8%	1
10 yr	Malignant hyperthermia susceptibility	38°c	No	Strabismus	19%	81%	0
12 yr	Morbid obesity	38°c	No	Myringotomy/tube	38%	62%	1
5 yr	Malignant hyperthermia susceptibility	38°c	No	Myringotomy/tube	29%	71%	1
2 yr	Asthma	38°c	No	Myringotomy/tube	53%	47%	2
2 yr	Asthma	No	Purulent	RMI	48%	52%	2